# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

MEETING

+ + + +

THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 2006

The National Organic Standards Board convened in the Ramada Conference Center, 1450 South Atherton Street, State College, Pennsylvania, at 8:14 a.m., Kevin O'Rell, Chairman, presiding.

Chair

#### PRESENT:

KEVIN O'RELL

Vice Chair ANDREA CAROE

BEA JAMES Member

Member GERALD DAVIS

RIGOBERTO DELGADO Member KEVIN ENGELBERT Member

Member DAN GIACOMINI

Member HUBERT KARREMAN JEFF MOYER Member

NANCY OSTIGUY Member

Member JOE SMILLIE

JULIE WEISMAN Member

# NOP STAFF PRESENT:

MARK BRADLEY VALERIE FRANCES BARBARA ROBINSON DEMARIS WILSON ARTHUR NEAL TONI STROTHERS KATHERINE BENHAM J.D. MELVIN

# ALSO PRESENT:

MARK KASTEL GEORGE SIEMON ALBERT STRAUS TONY MOORE BILL CLYMER KIM DIETZ DAVID HILTZ LOU ANDERSON CAYSE WARF GWENDOLYN WYARD TINA ELLOR EMILY BROWN-ROSEN TOM HUTCHINSON DIANE GOODMAN MILES MCEVOY STEFFEN SCHEIDE DAVE CARTER RICK SEGALLA ADAM EIDINGER DAVE ENGEL DAVID DECOU BONNIE WIDEMAN

ZEA SONNEBAND ERIC SIDEMAN

# 

NOSB Presentations and Discussion on Deferred Sunset Materials and Action Items

Crops Committee (Gerald Davis)	
Livestock Committee (Hugh Karreman)	107
Handling Committee (Julie Weisman)	160
Joint Materials and Handling204	
Committees (Nancy Ostiguy)	204
Commercial Availability Committee	
	200
Report (Rigoberto Delgado)	<b>400</b>
	000
Public Comment	226
Presentation and Consideration of	395
Committee Action Items	
Crops Committee (Gerald Davis)	397
Livestock Committee (Hugh Karreman)	
Handling Committee (Julie Weisman)	
Joint Materials and Handling475	112
Committees (Julie Weisman)	106
Committees (ourse wersman)	490
	400
Presentation of Committee Work Plans	496
Adjournment	

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:14 a.m.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Call to order the continuation of the NOSB meeting. If everybody would either take their seat or take their conversation outside, please.

Okay today, this morning, we're going to start off with the presentation of each committee of their action items and discussion items. Because of the logistical issue we had with the pastor symposium, we normally would do this one day and then the next day come back and vote on items.

What we wanted to do was to have an opportunity for public comment after our discussion prior to our votes. So we'll be going through each committee with the presentation and discussion items, and then we will go into public comment.

Then we have an extended break for lunch period, which is designed to give committee chairs a chance to get their

committees together if need be for any conversation, to discuss the public comment that may change any of the recommendations that have been presented in the morning.

Then we'll come back in the afternoon, and the committees will go through updated and re-present any or current recommendations, and then will have we discussion and vote.

So this morning, we're going to start off with the Crops Committee. Gerald?

# Crops Committee Report

MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you. The Crops Committee had a long list of deferred sunset materials to go over, and it took an extensive amount of time to wade through the public comment and submitted information.

The first materials as а group would be the chlorine materials that hypochloride, listed calcium as chlorine dioxide, sodium hypochloride. The category of algicides, disinfectants uses, as and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sanitizers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'll read part of this committee summary, because it's fairly extensive, and would probably eat up too much time to read the whole thing.

public "Many comments were received by the NOP supporting the continued allowance of the use of the chlorine materials in this category. The most common reason given for the continued use was for safety the potential concerns, over contamination of organic produce by food-borne pathogens.

"A biq concern is that the public reaction potential negative to of illness outbreaks associated organically produced food would be catastrophic to the industry.

"Compliance with FDA and other health regulatory agency regulations and guidelines was another common concern.

"Some comments express concern about

the application of chlorine materials to organic product in excess of the NOP standard listed in the rule.

"These comments stated that chlorine concentrations well in excess of the NOP standard are used in some instances with the assumption that the material would be degraded or diluted at some later point in the handling process of the product, or at least before the produce reached the consumer.

Two of these comments, one from a vegetable sprout producer and a consumer association, specifically stated that the residual chlorine levels in solution must not exceed the NOP rule guideline, at the point at which the treatment solution is drained from the food being treated."

The Crops Committee agrees with the comments that more specific guidelines for the use of chlorine materials in organic crop applications are needed, but the committee also acknowledges that such a recommendation

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to add further addenda to the regulation is not the purview of this sunset document.

We're told a petition addressing those addenda changes for these materials would be more appropriate.

One commenter proposed peroxyacetic acid, which is a hydrogen peroxide acetic acid combination as a safer alternative disinfectant to chlorine. This comment also acknowledged that peracetic acid is currently not an allowed replacement for some of the chlorine application uses.

One comment objected the use of any synthetics in organic crop production, but failed to demonstrate how it violated OFPA.

I'll skip over some of the review of the technical evaluation report. Probably the new information in that concerns THMs or trihalomethane contaminants that can be present on crop surfaces when chlorine is applied to them.

It's kind of a metabolite or

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

something, once you use chlorine and it comes in contact with organic materials that may be on the produce.

That's the new information that some of the commenters mentioned, and the technical evaluation report mentioned.

Although it was noted by some that if the addendum to the use of these materials was corrected, to make sure that there are guidelines to control the amount of chlorine being used and limit it to precisely what the guidelines say in the NOP regulations, then that would minimize the risk of those THMs being produced, because you'd be using the proper amount of chlorine.

Skipping down to some of the other substitute materials that were presented as alternatives to chlorine, thus stating the case why they are not needed any more, citric acid or other acids such as acetic or ascorbic were mentioned as wholly natural substitute products that could be substituted for

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

chlorine materials as irrigation line cleaners and equipment sanitizers.

No information on the effectiveness of these materials in crop wash water was offered in the report. One commentator offered an example of acetic acid use in the meat industry as a carcass wash for surface sanitation.

particular instance, that is amended wash water to pH-3 to attain surface sanitation. Extrapolating this information to crop wash water, maintaining this low of a pH would take substantial and continual additions of acid, which would be corrosive to the handling equipment, corrosive to the workers in the operation, and the crop as well in any cases.

Other allowed substitute materials listed in report include the hydrogen peroxide, peracetic acid, vitreous ozone, alcohols, copper sulfate and salt-based algicides. sterilization and UV Steam

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mentioned radiation alternative as were practices that might make the use of chlorine In the opinion of the materials unnecessary. Committee, of the materials, Crops the peracetic acid appears to hold the promise as a safer alternative to chlorine and crop wash water applications.

It requires at least 50-fold lower concentration than hydrogen peroxide for sanitation efficacy in crop wash water, and would eliminate the bleaching or oxidizer effect problem associated with hydrogen peroxide use as a crop wash.

Peracetic acid was recommended for approval for this purpose by a previous NOSB, but has not cleared the NOP rulemaking process as yet.

Ozone, as mentioned by the report, has a strong tendency to off-gas from wash water and causes serious headaches and health problems in workers exposed to it. UV light from special lamps has been shown to be

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

effective in some limited applications. 1 2 conclusion, due to overriding food safety and regulatory issues, the Crops 3 Committee recommends the renewal of these 4 5 chlorine materials. Discussion? MEMBER KARREMAN: I just think you 6 7 guys really did a thorough checking into the alternatives here. I appreciate that. 8 MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy? 10 11 MEMBER OSTIGUY: I don't think we have an alternative, but to approve this, 12 because of food safety issues. 13 I would like record as encouraging continued 14 qo on research to find alternatives. 15 haven't quite decided, purely 16 because of that, whether or not I will vote in 17 18 favor or against renewal, purely as a message that we need to work on alternatives. 19 20 But so I just wanted to -- whichever end up finally voting on this, 21

absolutely do need to continue to do research

on alternatives. 1 2 MEMBER DAVIS: Of the peroxyacetic or peracetic acid alternative, which has a 3 much better profile with it as far as effects 4 5 the environment or possible negative on environmental or health concerns. 6 7 I had a question for Arthur and the Arthur, on that NOSB recommendation 8 program. that's been kind of hung up, I guess it was in 9 FDA for a while and now it's at OGC; is that 10 11 correct? Is there -- do you see any, in your 12 13 understanding of the process that watched so far, is there any reason to expect 14 that it would not come through the process now 15 that it's been there this long? 16 It should be okay. 17 MR. NEAL: 18 MEMBER DAVIS: Okay. So maybe perhaps soon we'll be seeing some movement on 19 that as a good alternative. 20

Yes, and there's going to be a while, I would

MEMBER OSTIGUY:

21

22

Some alternatives.

assume, between alternatives coming up and our eventual ability to do something about chlorine.

We may never be able to remove it, because there will be some uses that we will need it for food safety. But alternatives are a grand goal.

MEMBER DAVIS: Okay. Moving on, the next category of use as plant disease control.

No, I'm missing one. As insecticides and as plant disease control, the horticultural oils.

Pertaining to horticultural oils, comments were received saying that natural alternatives were available as replacements. Vegetable oils were mentioned as the natural product replacement, but were questioned to see if these are appropriate and effective.

According to a representative of one organic certifier, all the vegetable oil formulations for crop protection use have synthetic emulsifiers in them. Without the emulsifier, the oils would not work as a spray

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

material for crops.

I mean the oils would be oils, but they wouldn't be able to be mixed in a water solution to spray on a crop, to give the efficacy. It could be argued that these products would not be wholly natural substitutes.

Further comments were received, stating that multi-year grower comparative tests between vegetable oil products and the petroleum-derived oils showed that the vegetable oils did not control certain target pests adequately.

I want to thank Franz for your input of that written comments that you provided; they were helpful in showing us at least one example of where yes, we really would like to use vegetable oils if they would work for our disease in our situation.

Research data that could verify the claim that the vegetable oil alternatives are truly adequate as a replacement is needed.

1	The committee recommendation, based on
2	comments received, we recommend that we renew
3	this material in these categories of uses.
4	Discussion?
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald, I see that
6	the committee vote was 3 to 1. So there was
7	one opposed?
8	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. That was
9	me.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Can we hear from
11	the minority?
12	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Basically, it's
13	the same logic that Nancy used with chlorine.
14	I'm just going to vote no, because I think
15	there needs to be a better alternative, not
16	because I want to handicap any growers today,
17	but just to make a statement.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: One of the things
20	that I would like to encourage some specific
21	research to be done on in this area is why the
22	vegetable oils would not be as efficacious, if

it turns out that that's accurate. 1 2 It's supposed to a suffocating kind of process for insects, and in that case, oils 3 should be oil. I'm just curious 4 why petroleum-based product would be better than 5 the vegetable oil, if we're supposed to be 6 7 covering that insect with oil to block its sphericals? 8 It's just curious. Why doesn't it 9 work, and if we understood why, then we may be 10 11 able to come up with a more natural substance. 12 MEMBER DAVIS: Yes. The theory that they should work makes sense. 13 MEMBER MOYER: That's why they were 14 tried. 15 16 MEMBER DAVIS: But I struggled to 17 find data, research data that showed that --18 to back that up. 19 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Right, and I'm not 20 disagreeing that the data are not there to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

show that it works. But why, and then if we

could figure out why, it's a research area.

21

1	Why is it not working to suffocate, because if
2	it's covering the sphericals, that's where all
3	the air comes from?
4	MEMBER MOYER: Well then there was
5	also the question of the synthetic emulsifiers
6	that are used in that process with the
7	vegetable oils as well.
8	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Right.
9	MEMBER DAVIS: That's fairly
10	problematic.
11	MEMBER MOYER: Right. We don't want
12	to just trade one for the other.
13	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Uh-huh, uh-huh.
14	MEMBER DAVIS: Because they're all
15	petroleum-derived.
16	MEMBER MOYER: Right.
17	MEMBER DAVIS: Emulsifiers. So
18	we're not really taking any big step forward,
19	other than maybe the amount of material you're
20	putting on an emulsifier versus the oil
21	itself.
22	MEMBER OSTIGUY: It has to do with

oil hitting \$70 a barrel. We may have a lot of incentive for research for alternatives.

MEMBER MOYER: That's a good point.

MEMBER DAVIS: Any other discussion?

I'll move on to the next material. Hydrated lime as plant disease control. The renewal of hydrated lime was deferred for two reasons.

First, the Crops Committee thought that more information and public comment was needed. Second, because of concern that there was no OFPA category that specifically allows its use.

I think the second concern that there was no OFPA category that we could fit this into was really the main objection and reason for deferring it for further consideration.

Most people who are familiar with it know that if this is produced by heating, you know, regular ground limestone to very high temperatures and then adding water to make hydrated lime or calcium hydroxide.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

It's been produced for a long time, and it's used on a lot of things. Some of the environmental concerns listed are in committee Ιt just summary. summarizes basically concerns about the manufacturer and material, mining more of the environmental or health concerns based on the intended use.

Most of the public comments were in favor of keeping hydrated lime on the national list. Although not that many people specifically mentioned it, they just included it in their -- yes, we'd like this and their wish list of all the materials.

The manufacturer of lime sulphur, which many commentators said that they could not form organically without, requires the use of hydrated lime, as does the production of Bordeaux mixture, which is a copper-containing compound.

Lime sulphur is used to control fungus, mites and insects in apples, grapes,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

blueberries, cherries and other tree and vine crops.

Some commentators made the point that lime sulphur has been used for many years with no recorded loss of effectiveness. One commentator stated that no synthetic substances should be allowed in organic, but failed to show how these materials violate OFPA.

In the opinion of this committee, hydrated lime should be considered a production aid insofar as it is vital to the production of two exempted sulphur or coppercontaining materials, in order to make these materials more non-biotoxic to plants.

On a split vote, the committee recommended not renewing the material to the national list, mainly for the lack of an OFPA category for it. Discussion?

MEMBER WEISMAN: Yeah, Joe. We've already mentioned a couple of times that one of the tasks that we haven't accomplished yet

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

but that is on our work plans is realigning the list to conform to OFPA categories.

If that were already accomplished, would that have changed? Is it possible that that might have changed your vote?

MEMBER DAVIS: Well, realigning the list to match the -- to fit them into the categories is that discussion and the stream of thought is what brought up th problem in the first place, that where do we put this material?

It comes down to the suggested, the best places that have been suggested. One would be to lump it in the production aid category, which personally I think is that production aid category designation for material sprayed to crops, is kind of a slippery slope thing that we could enter into, where all kinds of synthetic materials could be suggested.

"Well, let's call them a production aid and put them in there," although the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

program NOP did mention that, you know, that is a possible way of doing it, and could be supported legally, from their opinion.

The other thing, one commenter yesterday mentioned to me that it could fall into that exemption category of vitamins or minerals, because it is a calcium mineral, which is great for the one use.

But for hydrated lime, it's more of a problem because the use of it is for plant disease control, and it's not being used as a mineral. So it's a stretch either way in my opinion, although in my opinion personally, the material is really not a threat to an environment as used.

It's very important to many growers.

I didn't realize that in our discussions with
the committee, that there were a tree fruit
growers that use the material straight.

MEMBER MOYER: Yeah. That didn't really come out in our initial discussions.

MEMBER DAVIS: No. We didn't have

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that information.

MEMBER MOYER: As follow-up discussions, you know, through these meetings and through e-mails, I think that that's become more apparent to the committee.

MEMBER DAVIS: So for the limited amount of materials that an organic tree fruit grower has to control diseases, it is perceived now that it would be a severe impact for those growers to remove this material, over something a simple as "Well, we don't have an OFPA category for it."

MEMBER WEISMAN: Can I also make one more comment about the lack of OFPA categories, which might make your dilemma feel a little less difficult.

The lack of -- there is no OFPA category for allowed naturals, or allowed agricultural products, but those categories do exist on the list. There is some precedent for their being categories.

MEMBER DAVIS: The allowed category

-- we summarize that when we say is there an OFPA category. It refers to exempted synthetics. Is there a category of exempted synthetics that this fits into, and that's where we're struggling.

Although, you know, I feel for the growers that, you know, I have tree fruit growing in my background, and I don't currently do that right now.

But I know that there's not a lot of material that they have to use to control fungus diseases and things like stone fruit, peaches and apricots.

This is one of their mainstays which we didn't realize as a committee, as part of our thinking process. That's only come to light now at this meeting in some of the comments that we received subsequent to the recommendation.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: One question that I would have, which will also come up a little bit later, I know more about that particular

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

item. Is there a way for the particular diseases that they are attempting to control with the hydrated lime, for that to be addressed by species selection, variety selection of the stone fruits?

You know, there are more and less susceptible varieties. Sometimes that applies for a particular product that we're using, that if we selected a less susceptible variety we'd be better off.

That is supposed to be something we do up front, in order to reduce the need for things like this, and that's actually my question, is do we have any information about whether or not variety selection could reduce the need?

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Angie?

MEMBER CAROE: Well, the only comment I would have about that is that we're looking at sunset. We're looking at growers that have trees in the ground. You're talking about three years before a peach tree starts

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

producing again, a new tree is going to start 1 2 producing. it's three years without 3 So our grade of peaches if we do that. 4 5 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Ι Ι mean, understand that, but if you're not -- you're 6 7 not going to eliminate or even reduce the use of this material, if you just continue to 8 renew it on the list. 9 My point is well, 10 MEMBER CAROE: 11 unless you were to get a petition and re-list it with an annotation or --12 13 MEMBER OSTIGUY: But there are wholly natural alternatives. That's part of 14 my point. If, and I'm not saying -- I don't 15 know this. I don't know if 16 there 17 varieties that can address this. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff and then Joe. 18 MEMBER MOYER: Yes. In many cases, 19 Nancy, there are varieties that are 20 less The committee talked about that, 21 susceptible. and as Andrea mentioned, there is this time 22

delay, particularly with perennial tree fruit crops, where you have a three to five year time delay between when you plant the tree and when you can begin to harvest fruit.

But we also understood your dilemma that, as long as this is on the list, it discourages folks from seeking out either the varieties that do exist or pursuing the development of new varieties.

So that it is a difficult situation for us, with these fruits that take so long to come to fruition. And also with a lot of the tree fruits, for better or for worse, consumers tend to buy by name, and a lot of the varieties that they're asking for are not on the list of disease-resistant cultivars.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?

MEMBER SMILLIE: Yeah, I've had a lot of experience with scab-resistant apple trees, and it takes years and years of breeding and development, and then --

It takes years of breeding and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

development, and then oftentimes you'll breed an apple tree that will be scab-resistant, which is a big, big problem on the East Coast for organic apples.

You'll get a scab-resistant tree. It will get out into trials, and they'll find out that well, it's more susceptible to cedar rust than it was to apple scabs. So it takes years and years of breeding and development, and then oftentimes other problems occur.

Fungus is a really difficult issue to deal with, especially in wet climates. I know East Coast growers are just -- that's a continual battle, to deal with the various different fungus problems.

Colorado, though, has got a better break. Usually California's doing well, but when it rains a lot in California, then they have the same problem.

It is a long-term solution to work for disease-resistant trees, but it's just that it takes a lot of time because of the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

perennial nature and things like that.

I can tell you this: No tree fruit grower likes spraying this stuff. This is -- I mean, if they can find solutions, they will grab at them, because this is nasty stuff to live with. It corrodes your equipment. It's a real pain.

MEMBER MOYER: Well, not only that. There's no residuals, so you have to spray.

MEMBER SMILLIE: You've just got to be out there all th time.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: You need to be recognized, because we have -- if you're going to speak, put your hand up, because otherwise we've got Arthur here and then we have Hugh would like to make a comment. So Arthur, Hugh and then Jeff, I'll come back to you if you want. Arthur?

MR. NEAL: Arthur Neal, National Organic Program. I also just want to remind everyone that as part of the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for this sunset

process, one of the key items that we stressed we needed was economic impact data.

Because you've got an industry that used this for five years that's now relying on it. In order for us to get this rulemaking done in time, we have to know the impact that this is going to have on their particular sector that has used this material for the past five years.

This particular material has come through properly. The comments say "Let's renew it." We've got a recommendation to not renew it, but we don't have any data to support not renewing it.

So I just want to remind you that economic impact data was requested in that Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, because we have to justify every decision that we make thoroughly.

That's why this sunset process is so complex, because it entails other areas just - other than the technical side.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh, then Kevin.

MEMBER KARREMAN: This hydrated lime is an interesting thing, because we're going to talk about it in livestock too when we get to it, but part of the problem in livestock, just momentarily, is that you cannot apply it to the ground, certified organic ground.

And yet now we're also considering applying it to trees for whatever the problem is. There's some inconsistency here.

# CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?

MEMBER ENGELBERT: I agree, Hugh. That's another point that I was going to make. But I also want to respond to Arthur. We looked for economic impact data, and like Jeff said, we found very little comment, very little information to go on.

It's just been a problem for us to know what to do with it. It's a mined substance, it's a mineral, but it's heated to a thousand degrees and processed. We're unsure about the heavy metal content of it,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

and we just weren't sure what to do with it.

We didn't want to open up another can of worms by putting it some place it shouldn't be.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald.

MEMBER DAVIS: In response to Nancy and your resistant variety question, now in every tree fruit variety I've ever seen, when they talk about resistance, it's never complete resistance. It's just a matter of degrees.

The other thing is that for peach and apricot, you know, stone fruit growers, they grow a multitude of varieties, from early to mid- to late-season varieties, to give them as long of a season as possible.

You know, it's a lot of varieties in some cases. So to find a variety that's resistant enough to resist the disease in all time slots, it gets pretty complicated to tell them "Well, just find the resistant varieties," when the resistance is not

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	complete anyway for things like brown rot, you
2	know, which basically either rots the blossoms
3	off before they ever make a fruit, or later
4	on, rots the fruit so it's unmarketable.
5	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Uh-huh, uh-huh.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any other
7	comments?
8	MEMBER GIACOMINI: I was just
9	wondering if Gerald Gerald?
10	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
11	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Could you discuss
12	or do you have anything to say regarding
13	Hugh's statement on applying it on cropland?
14	MEMBER DAVIS: I'm not sure I
15	understand your question.
16	MEMBER GIACOMINI: The statement
17	that Hugh made regarding not being able to
18	apply hydrated lime on cropland. Is there any
19	implications in, that you could discuss on
20	that in this regard?
21	MEMBER DAVIS: The information
22	provided to us from some comments point out

information that pertains to that, Hugh, where they mention that the use rates of hydrated lime for plant disease control is typically ten pounds per acre applied several times, maybe three, four times, during the infection periods for the disease.

They add up to only, you know, 30, 40 pounds per acre per season, whereas a soil application rate, which is not allowed, would be much -- many orders of magnitude greater than that, to provide any change or economic benefit to the grower.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Why is it not allowed for soil amendment in general?

MEMBER DAVIS: Because of its reactivity and synthetic nature, you know. It has to be a specific reason for allowing it for exempted reasons, and because it's a synthetic and it is reactive in the soil environment, it has too many things going against it, I guess, for having it on the list in general as a fertilizer. That would be my

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	opinion, at least.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald, did the
3	committee, looking at the comments that came
4	in from PCO and they had talked about the
5	well one, that they said the removal of one of
6	the very few limited options should not be
7	made without further consideration and input
8	from organic fruit growers.
9	They also addressed the concern that
10	you had for the OFPA category, and did you
11	read that comment there?
12	MEMBER DAVIS: I had not read that
13	yet.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I would suggest
15	that the committee certainly consider that,
16	and have their point of view on the record.
17	MEMBER DAVIS: CCOF, that certifier
18	also provided an extensive comment on hydrated
19	lime, that covers those areas too. But I
20	didn't read this particular one.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. I guess my

concern is that the majority of commenters

were in favor of continued use, and it seems 1 2 to be that it's hung up in the committee, mostly because of categorizing from OFPA. 3 Ιt seems to be that there is 4 5 recognized need out there, from what I'm public 6 hearing from comments. I'm 7 concerned that do we have enough from the committee justify renewing 8 to not product? 9 In my opinion, now 10 MEMBER DAVIS: 11 that the additional input has come in, I don't think we have enough justification to not 12 renew it. I haven't heard from you on that, 13 Jeff, but --14 MEMBER MOYER: No, I agree. 15 If we were to have this vote today, this vote would 16 not come out this way within our committee. 17 18 MEMBER KARREMAN: Are we having this vote today? 19 20 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, we're going 21 to have the vote this afternoon. So, and 22 that's the purpose of the discussion. So am I

hearing now that there's a committee thought 1 2 of changing the recommendation or a --I can only speak for 3 MEMBER MOYER: myself, but in my -- as a member of that 4 5 committee, I would vote to renew it today, having heard all those comments which weren't 6 7 available to us when we did this. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay, and that's 8 9 all part of the process, which is good. MEMBER DAVIS: So we will need to, 10 11 as a committee, convene to craft the changes in the recommendation, and see how the vote 12 comes before the full board. 13 14 You know, based that on recommendation, I think there's 15 enough evidence that it's probably the more likely 16 17 way it will turn out, is that it will be renewed rather than not renewed. 18 19 Okay. Next substance category of 20 uses, algicides, disinfectants and sanitizers, 21 including irrigation system cleaners, and as

plant disease control, hydrogen peroxide.

This is similar to the hydrated lime question. The biggest thing is where do we fit this in in a synthetic exemption category within OFPA, which is why it was deferred.

The technical evaluation report for hydrogen peroxide shows that the substance does not occur naturally, but poses no true threat to the environment because it easily breaks down into water and oxygen, or hydrogen and hydroxol (ph), depending on pH.

The potential uses of this material are many. The concentrated material is quite caustic to people handling it, but as used in the field and its effect in the environment, it's considered relatively innocuous material, because of its -- it breaks down to just totally natural materials very, very quickly.

There are no known cases of hydrogen peroxide causing environmental contamination.

All public comments except one were in favor of keeping hydrogen peroxide on the national list.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

This was a lone dissenter that again was against synthetics in general, but didn't really justify their position and how it violated OFPA. Most commentators agree that there are no known adverse impacts on humans or the environment from either the use or manufacture of hydrogen peroxide.

Most of the commenters stated that there are no other similar products available are more compatible with organic production practices, and that the availability of hydrogen peroxide probably lessens damage to the environment and harm to lowering the by amount of toxic humans, substances used as alternative measures.

Regarding whether the OFPA provides an exemption category that would permit hydrogen peroxide to be considered for inclusion on the national list, the NOP provided feedback to the NOSB that hydrogen peroxide could be considered a production aid under Section 6517 of the OFPA.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

As a result, hydrogen peroxide would be eligible for continued use in organic production. The committee recommendation was to renew the material. Any discussion? Kevin?

MEMBER ENGELBERT: I'd just like to go on record as saying I think it's one of the underused, invaluable resources organic farmers have, in not just crop production also in livestock but and sanitation.

MEMBER DAVIS: Okay. The next material, as plant disease control, streptomycin and oxytetracycline for fire blight control in apples and pears.

Several commenters were proponents of keeping the materials on the list. Upon subsequent Crops Committee contacts with these commentators, as well as several organic pear growers and crop consultants in Washington and California, is it clear that there is extensive support for the continuation of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

these materials on the list.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The fire blight disease is deadly to all of trees, and the growers pear and surveyed had tested the consultants alternative materials listed in the technical evaluation report.

All opinion that the had the alternative materials mentioned were very much below efficacy the of streptomycin and tetracycline, and did not prevent fire blight to a high enough degree to keep trees from succumbing to the disease.

One commenter noted streptomycin and oxytetracycline for removal from the list, mentioning two of the alternative materials alluded to above, which would be Blight Ban or Serenade as viable control options.

Some commenters objected to any synthetics being used in organic production.

Reviewing the technical evaluation reports for these two materials shows that both materials are created by streptomyces

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

soil bacteria, through natural processes, and are produced in commercial quantities through a fermentation process, with subsequent chemical processes to isolate and purify the substance produced by the bacteria.

Tetracycline is presumed to undergo a chemical change from the natural oxytetracycline to calcium oxytetracycline. It was unclear to the reviewer if streptomycin undergoes a chemical change during the manufacturing process.

I won't read all the summary of the effects, although environmental the usual this material involves concern with t.he this, these materials concern about being in the environment on plants might sprayed crossover effect of causing resistance in bacteria that can be transferred to bacteria that infects humans, which would therefore render these antibiotics no longer useful for in humans for disease use prevention.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Some of the EPA data mentioned in the technical evaluation report pointed out that as far as human consumption of these antibiotics on fruit, that there has never been any detectable residues found. Probably they attribute that to the fact that it's always used during bloom, you know, many, many days pre-harvest, and not used throughout the season to where there could be a chance of residue left on the fruit.

In actual practice, you know, the pre-harvest intervals are 30 days on pears and 50 days on apples, as far as the EPA regulations, what they're allowed.

But in actual practice, in Washington state the usual interval between the last application at bloom time of oxytetracycline and calcium on organic pears, the usual interval is 90 plus days, depending on the variety.

The information provided in the report and subsequent information from

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

commenters gave ample documentation that the materials are in the environment very briefly, and degrade from UV light exposure very quickly, in the order of one to three days, depending on the material.

A wholly natural substitute product mentioned in the report is noted above, along with one other that was noted by a commenter.

Other already-allowed substances that could be substituted are peracetic acid and copper materials, such as Bordeaux mix.

The tendency for fruit scarring and cracked from copper use on apples and pears, especially Bosque pear, is well-documented, and is avoided by growers by using it at prebloom only, whereas the bloom period is the usual time of fire blight infection.

No known crop label formulation of peracetic acid is available at this time.

The comments that I received, and I say "I" because I wrote the recommendation and gathered a lot of the information, but the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

comments were submitted in writing subsequently from a couple of sources.

Talk about just how devastating it would be to the growers if we removed these materials, and there seems to be a lot of passion on both sides, as far as those who say antibiotics in organic production is a no-no, should never happen, and they have a philosophical position against it.

Whereas the economic impact to these growers would be extreme, and you know, as a former tree fruit grower myself, I can testify that I have watched trees die, my own trees die from this disease. It is dreadful, a dreadful, dreadful disease.

So I can appreciate the passion with which the growers come and try to support the continued use of it, because pears are -- particularly pears, but even apples, are very, very difficult to control this disease. Discussion?

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

First of all, thank MEMBER JAMES: you Crops Committee for all your work on all of these different substances. I just want to ask if you could elaborate a little bit, so that understand how there's Ι can the justifiable argument for use of antibiotics in crops, when there is not justifiable argument for the use of antibiotics in livestock?

MEMBER DAVIS: Some of the data that was given to us, and some of it just recently, just yesterday actually, point out two studies that talk about antibiotic use in livestock, you know, for meat production.

There has been documented cases of crossover contamination in the environment, however you call it, to where they can track antibiotic usage in livestock production to antibiotic resistance in humans, because of that use in livestock.

Because it's in the meat, it's consumed by humans and it's much more direct

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

contact to provide that change. I don't know.

I'm losing the words. But in this case, used
this way on plants, it is never been supported
or documented that This is a way that is
likely to happen.

MEMBER JAMES: The followup on that.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Followup, and then

MEMBER JAMES: Okay. However, I think with just the spirit of organic, that the use of antibiotics, whether it's directly with animals or whether it's on soil, or in the air, I think that the concern that I've heard, especially from Rebecca yesterday, was that it goes against the basic fundamental principles of organic practices.

MEMBER DAVIS: A lot of -- one comment I had that I've noticed in this is a lot of this is in semantics and what we call these materials. On a technical basis, these materials have an OFPA exemption category as toxins derived from bacteria.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Nancy.

We call them antibiotics because they are used in animals, in humans, ingested and they provide systemic control of diseases in us.

This use is truly a topical application on apples, far removed from that whole environment of problems that are associated with antibiotic use in livestock and humans.

So it's because of the wording that's used, they're called antibiotics. In my opinion, these materials get lumped in a different category than some of the other biological materials we use already that are well-accepted, like BT materials, the other biological control materials, which are all toxins derived from bacteria.

Why we don't call those antibiotics is because they're not used in humans or livestock, and ingested for controlling diseases, in my opinion.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I actually don't have a philosophical objection to the use of antibiotics in organics. What I do object to strongly is the prophylactic use of any antibiotic.

We don't allow any in animals because of the residue. Those residues that we know, you know, that are measurable, that we can do that tracking of antibiotics used in animals and then antibiotic resistance showing up in humans, is with prophylactic use, or use for growth promotion.

This particular use is prophylactic. It is used prior to disease demonstrating itself. When Zee and I were talking about this, she was saying "Well, if you had it last year, you're going to have it this year, but it hasn't shown up this year."

Disease, as we defined it, it has to have symptoms that are showing today, versus at subclinical levels. We all have in our bodies -- it would be very doubtful that it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

would be impossible to extract from any one of us at any particular time anthrax spores.

But we don't have enough anthrax spores in us to cause disease. So the presence of the disease organism is not sufficient, in my mind, to say that we should use an antibiotic. So you don't use it until you have a disease.

Now I will fully grant you that in this particular instance, once disease the itself, it's too late. But presents philosophically, what we have going on here is the prophylactic use of an antibiotic, and in antibiotic the same that can get way we result of the resistance as а abuse antibiotics in livestock animals, we can see the same kind of resistance occurring with bacteria because of the spread of this in the environment.

MEMBER DAVIS: Can I respond to her comment?

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: You respond, and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

then I have Jeff.

MEMBER DAVIS: Growers and professionals working in the, you know, university and other professionals working in the tree fruit industry would challenge that it's a prophylactic use.

Prophylactic use would be to apply it every three days during the entire bloom period, to protect against the infection, whether it's going to happen or not. What they do is they use disease prediction models, various names in Maryland. I think it's called marablight, and in Washington I think they call it cougar blight.

They're very specific disease modeling prediction models that tell the grower the conditions are now right for infection; go spray.

So instead of 10 to 15 applications stretched out every three days to keep a prophylactic coverage, which they can't really afford to do anyway, they are able to limit

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

their sprays to, in comments I received, was 1 2 two to three in a usual year; in a bad year maybe four to five. 3 It's all based on these prediction 4 5 models that say when there is potential, because again, they cannot wait until they see 6 7 By then, it is in the tree. It moves systemically and you have 8 varying degrees of damage; in some varieties 9 as much as complete tree death eventually. 10 11 doesn't happen that year but it just continues and continues until the branches wilt down and 12 die. 13 MEMBER OSTIGUY: I'd like to respond 14 to that. 15 16 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes Nancy. MEMBER OSTIGUY: I disagree with you 17 18 that that's not prophylactic use. That is 19 actually the definition of prophylactic use, 20 is you predict when you need it and you use it 21 before you see the symptoms.

agree, that

fully

Ι

22

this

in

situation, you can't wait to see the symptoms 1 2 if you're going to actually have anything 3 efficacious. it is still prophylactic use. 4 5 You still have a situation where you are putting antibiotics out into the environment 6 7 that used control health are to human diseases, and you can look at or you can get 8 cross-resistance. 9 these particular, and 10 Then 11 having trouble with these two particular antibiotics with human diseases. We're unable 12 13 to use them. The CDC has gone on record as streptomycin 14 opposing the of use and oxytetracycline in conventional 15 crop Why should we be different in 16 production. 17 organic crop production? CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff? 18 19 MEMBER MOYER: Yes. I would say the issues that are coming up are exactly --20 21 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh, then Arthur.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MEMBER MOYER:

22

--what we struggled

with on the committee. I mean there were many of us, or several of us, that wished the materials had never been on the list in the first place.

But now that they are on there, you know, the economic impact, the data that we were getting from the growers was that they could not survive at all without this. So that's what we were responding to.

MEMBER KARREMAN: I'd just like go on record as agreeing completely with Nancy Ostiguy on this, and that on the whole topic of antibiotic use in organic agriculture, especially prophylactically, is prohibited.

How I wish we could use antibiotics occasionally therapeutically in livestock. I realize we're talking about crops, but you know, if there's CDC data saying there's cross-resistance or whatever, I just don't --

I just can't vote to allow it or to continue to allow it, Because in livestock, one of my main things, and I'm fascinated by

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

it, is to come up with natural treatments for diseases in living creatures, so I don't have to use an antibiotic.

I think that's a lot harder and a lot more demanding than for crops, in a sense, I mean for living creatures.

So I would think that if I'd been challenged and I can come up to a point where I hardly ever use an antibiotic for an animal -- I will occasionally -- that animal has to be removed.

I would think that in the Agronomy Departments of all the land grants in this country, they could come up with alternatives to these two substances for use.

MEMBER DAVIS: But they haven't.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, they haven't and you know, they haven't technically in livestock either, but I'm trying, and I imagine there would be good, you know, people who have organic in their heart that will try to find alternatives.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	If this stays on the list, that is
2	the incentive to find alternatives is not
3	there. I have no alternatives for
4	antibiotics. Therefore, the incentive is
5	there for me to study and practice with
6	natural treatments.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur, I think
8	you wanted to make a comment, and then the
9	MR. NEAL: I just wanted to add,
10	for your own knowledge, that when you make
11	these type of decisions, always try to make
12	sure that we ground ourselves in OFPA as well,
13	because if I'm not mistaken, OFPA mentions
14	antibiotic use, Particularly in livestock
15	production.
16	Not so with crop production, and
17	even in its restriction of antibiotic use in
18	livestock production, it references growth
19	promotion and also some therapeutic use.
20	So I just wanted to add that to the
21	record for your thoughts and consideration.
22	MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you, Arthur.

Bea?

MEMBER JAMES: Well, first of all, I just have to point out that yesterday we were talking about yeast as a form of livestock, so I think that it's pretty broad when we say that application to tree to deal with a fungus is, for some reason, a specialized case, as opposed to livestock.

Then also I wanted to say that my understanding of prophylactic use does not mean that it necessarily has to be a three-day application. The concentrations can be so significant that the application stays on for up to two weeks.

Therefore, you have your prophylactic application, according to your argument, Jerry. But I do -- I think that people also would be -- I mean we've talked a lot about consumer perception at this meeting, and I think that people, we have to take into consideration.

But if the public knew that we were

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

applying antibiotics to crops, that that would 1 2 not be well-received. 3 MEMBER DAVIS: Can I respond to that? 4 5 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald can respond, and then Andrea and then Dan. 6 7 MEMBER DAVIS: The statement there about using high enough rates to make it last 8 two weeks is not accurate. These 9 up to growers are constrained to application rates 10 11 at a certain rate, and they're only allowed to use that much, and it's very, very expensive 12 material. 13 To just put it on at three to four X 14 rates to make it last longer is illegal and 15 16 prohibitively expensive. But I do have, 17 within the comments handed to me 18 meeting, а statement about the crossresistance of antibiotics -- to antibiotics, 19 20 from a Ph.D. plant pathologist. I could read it, it would be 21 Ιf

useful, I think. First, they point out that

there are 50 million pounds of antibiotics used annually in the U.S., according to this statement, used in humans and/or livestock.

Of that, the amount of antibiotic used on these plants is 0.1 percent of that 50 million pounds. "Resistance in three human pathogens -- camphilobacter (ph), salmonella and e.coli has been directly linked to use of antibiotics in the production of animal products.

"Despite more than 30 years of use in plant agriculture, there has been no documentation of resistance development in pathogens of humans from plant use.

"The major concern regarding plant use of antibiotics is that organisms exposed to antibiotics in the orchard and field environment will transfer antibiotic resistance to pathogens of humans.

"However, it is well-known by microbiologists that for successful bacterial conjugation to take place, both species of

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

bacteria must successfully co-exist in a similar environment.

"Conjugation between bacterial species endemic in the outdoor ecosystem and human pathogens is unlikely Because conditions suited to the survival of each species ensures the destruction of the other.

"Bacteria that live on fruit and vegetables surfaces are quickly destroyed in the gastric environment. conversely, with the possible exception of some strains of salmonella in protected microenvironments, human pathogens are quickly destroyed when exposed to the outdoor environment.

"Additionally, antibiotics in the outdoor environment are quickly photo-oxidized. Efficacy of antibiotics against plant pathogens persist for less than 72 hours post-application, because of rapid degeneration in the field environment."

That is from Roberta Spitko, Ph.D.,
Plant Pathologist, New England Fruit

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Consultants, Montague, Massachusetts. It was submitted to the program as comments in 2000, shortly after the materials were added to the list the last time.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea.

MEMBER CAROE: I just want to point out in the TAP review it clearly states that there are no reason to believe that there's any antibiotic residues on the fruit. So it's not going to transfer.

It also clearly states that line 320 of the streptomycin that EPA has found no data indicating that streptomycin pesticide residues remaining in food supply would have a significant or even measurable potential for increasing resistance to that drug through oral exposure.

It goes on further to say that EPA recognizes that there's a potential risk to agricultural workers developing antibiotic resistance, but then goes on and says that this is lessened by the re-entry time on the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

label.

This is all according to label use, and organic growers are not exempt from label use requirements, and I want to reiterate, you know, my dealing with growers, and I do deal with growers on a daily basis, you know, smart growers that stay in business don't use these things unless they have to, because it's money out the door. It's the profit margin disappearing.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. I have Dan, Kevin and then Nancy.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: In looking at these issues, and in looking at how I would evaluate them, two things that came to me was reasonableness and consistency.

On the reasonableness side, I am very conscious and aware of the implications to the growers to lose these items, and it would bother me very much to do that.

On the other hand, in spite of even the information that Andrea just read, on the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

consistency side, when we look from the livestock perspective, if we're prohibited from giving a shot of antibiotics to a day-old calf on the perception that has some effect on the milk two years later, I have a hard time with the consistency, you know, in continuing to allow the product.

This will be -- I have no idea right now how I'm going to vote. This will certainly be something I will be ruminating on over lunch.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: I just wanted to add one other thing to the things that Nancy and Bea and Hugh and Jeff has said, that hasn't been mentioned.

One of the reasons that I was the "no" vote, I'm not convinced that even though the EPA said there's no detectable residues, that that is actually the case. The human body is sensitive to substances in levels of parts per trillion, and we are unable to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	measure that.
2	I'm not convinced that these
3	materials aren't absorbed by the tree, and do
4	end in the fruit. I do have the philosophical
5	problem with using antibiotics in organic
6	production. A thorn by any other name is
7	still a thorn.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Kevin.
9	Nancy?
10	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Well, and I
11	actually don't have that philosophical
12	disagreement.
13	MEMBER ENGELBERT: I do.
14	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I fully agree that
15	the EPA has not found and probably would not
16	find antibiotic residues on the fruit. That
17	is not my concern.
18	My concern is antibiotic resistance
19	that develops within the environment, and we
20	do have examples of that. The CDC has gone on
21	record, that this is not a minor issue.

start

When

we

22

unfortunately,

we're taking different disciplines' viewpoints and putting them -- and crossing over into fields where individuals have more and less information.

If we want to know about resistance that is going to show up to human pathogens, talking to a plant pathologist, with all due respect, that's not the group of people that we want to talk to.

We want to talk to physicians, public health people more importantly. Those are the ones that if we're looking at the resistance issue to human pathogens, that's where we go, and the CDC has gone on record being concerned about the use of tetracycline and streptomycin in conventional agriculture.

Using it in organic agriculture, in exactly the same way that we would use it in conventional agriculture, albeit a smaller use. Animals are the bigger issue. It's still a concern.

The CDC was specifically talking

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	about antibiotic use as a pesticide. They
2	were not talking about it in animal use when
3	they expressed their concern.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Could anybody with
5	the access get something off the web, off of
6	what their statement is?
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: We actually have
8	it.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Oh, we do.
10	MEMBER OSTIGUY: It's from the
11	material that Rebecca gave us.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I've got Andrea
13	and then to
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: All right, that's
15	fine. That's only a technicality.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Then Hugh.
17	Andrea?
18	MEMBER CAROE: I just I agree
19	Nancy, that if we were looking at this
20	material for the first time, talking to CDC
21	and considering that, that would be very
22	important.

1	But this is sunset, and I think the
2	plant path people have a lot to do with
3	whether, what the impact is on taking this
4	material off the list.
5	MEMBER OSTIGUY: And I agree with
6	that. In terms of the impact, it's severe.
7	MEMBER CAROE: And that's, you know,
8	I mean I think it takes a lot to handicap this
9	part of the industry, and the plant path
10	people, if they have no alternatives and this
11	is death to stone fruit.
12	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, pears. Just
13	a technicality here. It says that this to
14	renew this on the committee report it has
15	Kevin Engelbert moving to renew it, and it
16	doesn't sound like you
17	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No. I moved to
18	vote.
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yeah. That's
20	different.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: I'm sorry.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Bea?

MEMBER JAMES: Okay. This is just 
- I just finished my first year on the board.

Just for clarification, is our role to be the gatekeepers of the organic integrity for the sake of organic integrity, or for the sake of the economy? Can somebody answer that question?

MEMBER DELGADO: I think it's both.

It's a balancing act, and what I would like to suggest, if our mandate allows it, is to adopt an aggressive or an active position, to recommend to the research institutions around the country or the world, to develop specific alternatives for the items in the list that we think are the ones that are creating the most problems.

But I don't think we should eliminate these products right now, because we believe they're -- they have a certain degree of risk, just on those grounds. We have to weigh in the importance to the economy, and the benefit of the farmers in the short term.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

In the long term, we should be looking for other options. I mean, how do we encourage those? That's my question.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: We do have a

mechanism for that.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: I'd be responding to an earlier comment.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I have Andrea.

MEMBER CAROE: Okay. I just want to respond to you, Bea. I think the role is different in sunset. I really -- I think that acting on the concerns are much more important in sunset than they are in the initial consideration of a material.

So I don't feel that we're on the same ground as this board has looked at materials in the past. At this point, we have absolutely got to consider economic and availability of these products, and continue to keep them on the market, Because the effect is enormous.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

So I don't feel it's a compromise to organic integrity, but it is a shift a bit, when we're considering continuation of a material on the list.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?

MEMBER KARREMAN: To answer Rigo, I think we've already done that with methionine for poultry. There's been a kind of mandate set up by I forget what date, but there's active research going on because of what the NOSB has, you know, decided to ask the community to do.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That was, you know, that during not a sunset, but that was during the approval of a petitioned substance in terms. If we are, as Andrea said, if we're — it is different from sunset to reviewing a petition for a substance to be allowed or prohibited to the national list.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: But we don't need to tie it to the sunset, to say --

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Correct.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MEMBER OSTIGUY: -- the board has a 1 2 recommendation that we need to get 3 research done in this area. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Absolutely. 4 5 MEMBER OSTIGUY: And Ι think probably should do that, 6 at an absolute 7 minimum. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: 8 We can ao 9 record with that. Yes, I agree. 10 MEMBER SMILLIE: I agree with that, 11 and I just checked with Miles McEvoy from 12 Washington State, and their recommendation there, and they're one of the states with the 13 most knowledge and experience with this. 14 The recommendation is to continue 15 they're actively looking 16 but at 17 biologicals, that hopefully we'll be able to 18 replace it. So I think everybody's comments 19 are coming to the same thing. We want to put 20 a real tether on this one. 21 We're going to renew it for sunset,

but we're going to serve serious notice that

nd Bea.
okay.
hink he had
. But the
'antibiotic,"
substance is
ever reason,
yesterday up
yesterday up consumers buy
consumers buy
consumers buy
consumers buy
consumers buy ics used in product.
consumers buy ics used in product.
consumers buy cics used in product.
consumers buy cics used in product.

1	these items today as petitioned items to go on
2	the national list, all of those things would
3	be valid.
4	We have a substance that's been in
5	use for five years. We have concerns about
6	it, and those concerns should be stated in the
7	record and addressed. But we're hearing from
8	growers there is tremendous economic impact at
9	this time not to renew.
10	MEMBER KARREMAN: What if, though,
11	there were residues found upon the fruit in
12	the next two years?
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That's different.
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: And we renew this.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Somebody can
16	petition with new evidence
17	MEMBER KARREMAN: No, in media, in
18	the press, in the public, and we renew it now.
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: What if you found
20	out that glycerine is a carcinogen?
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Bea.
22	MEMBER JAMES: Okay. I guess my

1	concern is that yes, I understand that this is
2	a part of sunset. Sunset comes around every
3	five years. So we're renewing it for five
4	years, and this is a question for the NOP.
5	Is it possible to put forth a
6	recommendation that we would like to have it
7	taken off of the list within two years?
8	MEMBER OSTIGUY: That's an
9	annotation.
10	MEMBER SMILLIE: That's an
11	annotation.
12	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Arthur.
13	MEMBER SMILLIE: We can't
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur, do you
15	know?
16	MR. NEAL: Okay. With any
17	substance, you can renew for sunset and
18	clarify, deal with later. Anybody can
19	petition it the day after it's renewed, to get
20	it off the list.
21	MEMBER JAMES: I think I would like
22	I think that that needs to be written into

this recommendation. 1 2 MR. NEAL: Well, the thing -- I mean the thing to clarify, you don't want to put it 3 in the recommendation. 4 5 The thing that we really everybody to understand is that sunset, though 6 7 it has the potential for the substance being on the list for five years, doesn't mean that 8 it's going to stay on the list for five years. 9 I mean the board may find an issue 10 11 with it, and ask somebody to petition to have 12 it removed. You know, it's a process of assessing the continued need for the use of a 13 14 substance. O'RELL: 15 CHAIRMAN Is there any additional conversation, discussion along this 16 17 line, or should we move on? I think we've --18 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Beat it to death? I did have something 19 MEMBER DAVIS: 20 I wanted to read as far as stating towards the economic impact. 21

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

Okay.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL:

MEMBER DAVIS: Material that was submitted to the NOSB previously. This references some losses of trees and economic losses in recent history.

In 1998, apple and pear growers in Washington and Northern Oregon suffered million estimated \$68 in losses due to outbreaks of fire blight caused by the organism.

Since 1997, approximately 500,000 pear trees have been destroyed in the Po Valley of Italy, which is the major pear production area of the world, in an effort to eradicate fire blight.

These are all, you know, have footnotes as far as where these references are coming from.

Another 580,000 pear and apple trees were destroyed in Romania between 1993 to 1997, and 340,000 pear and apple trees were destroyed in Croatia since 1995, in efforts to halt the spread of fire blight in those

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

countries.

This is a year 2000 article. So they're referencing stuff between the mid-1990's through 2000, as far as losses.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Move on.

MEMBER DAVIS: Moving on. To finish this, the committee did recommend to renew the materials at this point, on a split vote obviously.

Okay. As plant or soil amendments, aquatic plant extracts, the alkali extraction of aquatic plant extracts.

They were deferred because there were questions that were raised, which included what are the manufacturing processes, what do the extractants and stabilizers do to the product, and are there non-synthetic aquatic plant products available.

Seaweed extracts can be produced from live, fresh plants using potassium hydroxide or sodium hydroxide, which are called alkalis in general. Potassium

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

hydroxide is the more preferred material due to concerns about the possible negative effects of sodium on the intended crops.

The raw plant parts are digested in the presence of the alkali, to break open the cell walls of the plants. Some manufacturers use pressure in this part of the process; some do not.

It is claimed that the high pressure environment allows the extraction of the cell contents of the kelp with less alkali, without the reduced yield of vital plant compounds that occurs by raising the temperature of the process, which is another way of aiding in the extraction.

After extraction, the insoluble fraction of the mixture is filtered out, and the liquid is either stabilized with an acid such as phosphoric, or dried to form a soluble powder, without acid stabilization.

Liquid formulations would be overtaken with bacterial growth if the pH were

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

not lowered to around 3.5. Natural acids such as citric are not able to accomplish this in the high pH alkali-type extracts.

The alkali extraction process does produce some chemical reactions in the raw material, although the complexity of the chemical mixtures found naturally in the plant material would make it almost impossible to quantify all of the chemical changes. This is according to the technical evaluation report.

Clearly, the extraction and stabilization of liquid kelp extracts in the alkali process does change the amount of potassium in the finished product, versus the raw plant, and would change the amount of phosphorous if a liquid material were allowed.

One manufacturer commented that their process does not use more alkali than necessary to produce the proper consistency of extract, and no more phosphoric acid than necessary to lower the pH of the extract to the exact point they need.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

They contend that the recommended use rates for their material is considerably less than one percent of the typical crop's nutritional need would be supplied.

To go beyond their use rates in order to obtain a fertilizer benefit from the material would be cost-prohibitive to the grower, and possibly detrimental the crop, due to the natural amount of sodium found in kelp and/or seaweed.

Their comments are in response to concerns that fortification with synthetic nutrients might be occurring, rather than simply extraction and stabilization of the product.

In answer to the question about are there non-synthetic aquatic plant products available, there is a product that would involve mechanical or physical disruption or pulverization of the seaweed. The liquid extracts are separated from the solids and stabilized with natural acids, and/or acetic.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

As described by the manufacturers, these materials would be considered non-synthetic. The component of plant growth substances in these products is said to be somewhat different than the alkali-extracted products.

I won't go on with that. The aquatic plant extracts used in organic crop production are completely unique in some of their beneficial attributes for crops.

There are no substitute products that provide the same benefits to growers. They are somewhat unique even when comparing the benefits of alkali extracts versus the non-alkali extracts.

The Crops Committee recommends the of material aquatic renewal the plant extracts, other than hydrolyzed extraction processes, limited to the use of potassium hydroxide or sodium hydroxide solvent use is that limited to amount necessary for extraction. Discussion?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MEMBER JAMES: Gerry, I have a question. I know that Armory has made several attempts to communicate their position. I was wondering if you could give your reaction to their comments regarding aquatic plant extracts?

MEMBER DAVIS: Yes. I responded to them in writing on their concerns. I wish I had brought that statement, to sort of be a little more complete. But the gist of it was that I appreciate their concern, that we need to have a delineation of what amount of extraction is allowed.

So we just don't have high amounts of potassium and hydroxide being used to produce a, you know, a potassium fertilizer that's synthetic, for use in organic production.

The materials are used -- I pointed out to them that the materials are used as a use rate of half a pound to a pound per acre per treatment, and that to get a true

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

fertilizer response from that potassium, you would have use it in the order of probably 15 to 20 pounds to get a true benefit.

At the cost of the material, that would be close to \$100 per acre per application. That would have to be done multiple times to fertilize the crop for potassium.

Whereas there's potassium sulfate is an allowed natural that is far, far cheaper than that. That's what growers would use if they needed to supplement for potassium.

I appreciate their concern that there's not funny stuff going on with the amount of extractant used, and that we should put a limit on it, and that's something that could be annotated by petition, to get specific guidelines in place.

But it wouldn't be our place to throw out the material and take off the alkali extracted products from the organic list in sunset. You know, they should address their

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

concerns through petition and annotation, rather than let's drop it from the list because of that concern.

MEMBER SMILLIE: No, I agree with Gerry. I've had a lot of experience using the material, and you don't fully apply potassium anyhow.

I don't think the fear there that we're using an artificial fertilizer, sneaking in an artificial fertilizer, is justified on any grounds at all. So I agree with you Jerry, and the recommendation of the committee.

Obviously, we need to tighten up and have more knowledge of the manufacturing process, which is continually evolving. There's a lot of different ways and there's new materials being used, like potassium carbonate, and that one gets petitioned.

So I think we can deal with the more knowledge on the material through the petitioning process.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MEMBER DAVIS: Are we done? Getting down there. Another material as a plant or soil amendment, humic acids.

Many commentators requested to keep humic acids on the national list. Two specific comments expressed concern about losing their ability to use water-extracted humic acids in their products that they make and sell to growers.

They were concerned that their water-extracted humic acid would be dropped from the list, along with alkali-extracted versions. This would not be the case, since a true water-extracted humic acid from a natural source, with no synthetic ingredients added, would by definition be allowed and would not need to be on the list.

The NOSB deferred the vote from the November 2005 meeting on humic acids in this form, the alkali extracts, until further information is obtained concerning the availability of water-extracted humic acids,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

which would be a wholly natural substitute.

A technical evaluation report was provided to the NOSB, in order to arrive at an appropriate recommendation.

The report described the manufacturing processes of alkali-extracted humic/folic acid, folic being a component of the material, as well as the uses and benefits of the substances.

The report gave no evidence of any harmful or adverse effects to the environment, ago-ecosystem or human health. No water extracted humic acid materials were described in the report.

Search of the scientific literature on humic acid and comments elicited from four separate humic acid producers suggests that leonardite coal, typically used to make humic acids, will not solubulize in water to any significant degree without adding the alkali materials for extraction purposes.

Subsequent Crops Committee contact

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

made with the commentators mentioned was above, to seek more information on their product. water-extracted The Coloradoproduced water-extracted humic acid explained that their product is extracted from peat.

When asked about the humic acid content of their product, they provided analytical lab test results of the material. Unfortunately, the submitted lab result document did not contain any statement as to the humic and/or folic acid content of the material, but merely listed the fertilizer content, such as NP&K (ph).

When asked about the absent data, the producer said they have not been tested for humic or folic acids, but only plant food content. This producer further explained that their product is marketed as a blended component of several products, and that it also includes ingredients, other materials such as glucose and enzymes.

The amount of humic substance

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

applied as a component of their products is typically about three ounces per acre, and are intended to improve soil health through enhancement of soil biology, but not as the soil amendment use as listed in the technical evaluation report.

By comparison, the typical crop application rates of humic acid of the alkali-extracted sort range from one to five gallons per acre for soils, and one to two pints per acre for folic use.

The Crops Committee makes no statement as to the validity of this product or other possible water-extracted humic acids.

This discussion is offered only in order to show that this particular water-extracted humic acid product available to the marketplace does not represent a functional replacement material for the alkali-extracted humic acid.

Further comments are welcome by the committee as to the availability of any water-

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

	extracted numic acids that may be functionally
2	equivalent, wholly natural substitutes for the
3	alkali-extract materials.
4	Based on the comments received and
5	the subsequent checking on the true nature of
6	the water extracted humic acids that were
7	alluded to, the Crops Committee recommends the
8	renewal of the following substance: humic
9	acids, naturally occurring deposits, water and
10	alkali extracts only. Discussion?
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Can we hear from
12	the minority?
13	MEMBER ENGELBERT: That would be Mr.
14	No again.
15	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Kevin, you can't be
16	Mr. No, because those are my initials.
17	(Laughter.)
18	MEMBER ENGELBERT: You're Mrs. No.
19	MEMBER CAROE: You're married.
20	MEMBER OSTIGUY: No, no. I am Dr.
21	No.
22	(Laughter.)

1	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Word play here.
2	We had so much to go over that I wasn't
3	comfortable with this. It didn't seem like an
4	essential material for organic production. I
5	just wanted to be sure there was Discussion
6	about it, because I think I still need to
7	learn a lot about it.
8	In my research, I couldn't find any
9	farmer that used it that thought it was
10	absolutely essential for organic production,
11	and I just couldn't learn enough about it in
12	the short length of time I had to work on it.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Was there anything
14	that was brought up to light in the public
15	comments that caused any concern in your
16	thinking?
17	MEMBER ENGELBERT: I have misplaced
18	my notes. I thought I brought them with me,
19	and so I don't remember that there was.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald, was there
21	anything in the public comments that would
22	MEMBER DAVIS: I think on this

issue, the reason we deferred it was because in looking at the public comments, we picked up these references to water-extracted humic acids.

really the reason they So investigate deferred is to well, referring to commenters are these extracted humic acids. We'd better check on wholly natural them and see is there а substitute, and that's really the only there was no negative reason for taking that vote.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I have the same recollection, that it was purely because of the mention of the water extracted, and what that would have meant is we could have taken it off the list, because then it would have been a natural process, etcetera. So that was the direction. It was not an interest in changing the annotation.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay, thank you.

Any other Discussion?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Hearing none.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER DAVIS: Moving on. Category of use as plant or soil amendments, and also as flotation agents in post-harvest handling, lignin sulfonates.

The question of whether there are non-synthetic alternatives to lignin sulfonates as plant or soil amendments as an issue during the sunset process consideration.

Lignin sulfonates are used extensively as key leading for а agent micronutrients in liquid fertilizer formulations approved for use in organic crops.

However, no information was supplied in the public comment to suggest any non-synthetic alternatives for this very common use of the material. Citric acid is a non-synthetic material that is considered to have a weak, kelating effect when used for this purpose, but is not directly comparable to the level achieved with the lignin sulfonates.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

The lignin -- on that side, lignin sulfonates are also used dust suppressants on roadways and can be used that way on organic farms, which in arid regions of the country like California, they are facing regulations, more and more environmental regulation minimizing dust on and the particulate counts in the air.

So farmers are targeted as producers of dust. So it would have а possible regulatory effect on organic growers in those where they face dust control areas, regulations.

Regarding floating agents in postharvest handling, the use for that purpose, a comment was received suggesting that physical agitation, bubblers, etcetera, could work as an alternative practice to the lignin sulfonate use.

Subsequent comments received, after checking on this, received, disputed that the use of physical agitation works in the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

handling of pears, which is the significant use of the flotation agent.

Part of this is pears are heavier than water and they add a couple of different materials to the water to make the pears float, so they can get them onto their packing lines.

The committee recommendation, the Crops Committee recommends renewing the following material to the following categories of use: As plant or soil amendment, and as being lignin sulfonate as a kelating agent, dust suppressant, flotation agent, and also as floating agents in post-harvest handling. The committee vote was 3 to 1.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?

MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes. Again, I would agree with that. There's more uses than that. It's also used as a seed coat a lot in the Midwest.

I would like to point out one of the issues with it is not a U.S. issue, but it is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

a Codex issue. It's not allowed in Codex and under the arrangement with Japan, U.S. producers are not allowed to ship products to Japan that have used lignin sulfonate.

It's one of the three items on the "no go" to Japan list. So not that that needs an annotation or anything, but it's just an awareness thing, that U.S. producers who do use it would not be allowed under the TM-11 export arrangement or under JAS certification to use that material.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Did you want to weigh in, Kevin?

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. I was the dissenting "no" vote again, for the same reasons as before. As Jeff and I talked, we want to keep organic and in some respects, we wish all these materials were off the list and had to be petitioned to be brought back on.

So we had more time to learn mor about them, because they just don't seem essential to organic production, and I don't

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

see how allowing them differentiates organic production and processing from conventional.

I think we're maybe betraying the public's trust with some of these substances, and I just wasn't comfortable rubber-stamping them or giving them an approval without some discussion from the whole board.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea.

MEMBER CAROE: Just a kind of overview statement about this. It isn't our job in sunset to reconsider -- we have to respect the previous board's decision. Acting on new information is one thing. Overturning a previous board's decision is not what we're about.

So I'm all in favor of considering any alternatives that have been approached, any new information that's come to light in the last five years.

But overturning a previous board's decision I think it's really disrespectful of the previous board members, and I don't want

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	to do that.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
3	MEMBER OSTIGUY: My question is
4	actually to Joe. If they use the lignin
5	sulfonate as a dust suppressant so it's not on
6	the crop, would that affect it, their ability
7	to export?
8	MEMBER SMILLIE: Good question. I'd
9	have to look
10	MEMBER DAVIS: Depending on the
11	buffer zone Joe, wouldn't it?
12	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yeah, I guess.
13	Japanese regulations are whole different
14	kettle of fish.
15	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Okay. I was just
16	asking.
17	MEMBER SMILLIE: Maybe it's a
18	different approach to it. I think the
19	objection was primarily because they went to
20	Codex, and for whatever reasons, Codex didn't
21	allow it.

I can't remember the history of it,

but it just came up a "we'll accept as everything you do, but not these three things." We go "Okay, fine." These three things aren't allowed. So I can find out more about the history, but --

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff.

MEMBER MOYER: I just wanted to go on record as saying I supported what Kevin was saying, and in our discussions in the committee, we both really want to keep organic organic, and have the --

If these materials were coming up, being petitioned to be put on the list, I would have voted no to not put it on the list.

But in support of what Andrea is saying, we do respect what form of words have done, and the fact that there was no new information, coming up to say it had to be removed.

I voted to, in this initial document, to keep it on the list, but do very much support what Kevin is saying.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MEMBER ENGELBERT: That's where
2	we're coming from. We just wanted to
3	MEMBER MOYER: Plus Kevin and I were
4	also very short on the learning curve when
5	Gerry dumped this on us. It was like
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: And you guys are
7	doing great.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yeah. You guys
9	absolutely did
10	MEMBER MOYER: It was a lot of
11	material to read in a very short period of
12	time, so it really was trial by fire.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: For each of you,
14	as new board members, and I've seen board
15	members over the last five years, and I can
16	say that you guys have been participating up
17	at a par that exceeds past experience. So
18	that's very welcome.
19	MEMBER SMILLIE: We appreciate that.
20	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. Thank you.
21	MEMBER DAVIS: And I feel pretty new
22	too.

1	(Laughter; simultaneous discussion.)
2	MEMBER DAVIS: It's not that we've
3	structured our role, but there was method to
4	our madness, so to speak. We just want to
5	make sure we were handling things properly.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That's fine. I
7	appreciate that for the record. Hugh?
8	MEMBER KARREMAN: I guess I just
9	want to say that we do need to respect the
10	past board's decisions. We need to have
11	continuity. We need to know the history of
12	the board.
13	But I certainly do not feel bound to
14	not overturn a previous board decision. I
15	just want to put that on the record.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, and I'm not
17	going to speak for Andrea, but I think what
18	Andrea is saying that without information,
19	we're here for the public, and during the
20	sunset process, that's when the public input
21	comes in.

there's

no

new

So

if

22

public

1	information and the public supports an item,
2	and there's nothing new out there to say we
3	shouldn't go forward with it, then I do think
4	there's some credence to the past.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: In this context,
6	yes. But I mean in general, there could be
7	policy decisions made three years ago that are
8	going to change each year.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No, no, no.
10	Things always change and evolve. I think her
11	comments were related to sunset.
12	MEMBER KARREMAN: Agreed.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Last
14	material.
15	MEMBER KARREMAN: You've still got
16	one?
17	MEMBER DAVIS: Last one.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.
19	MEMBER DAVIS: Category of use as
20	another flotation agent in post-harvest
21	handling, sodium silicate.
22	The only comment on sodium silicate

received during the sunset comment period in August 2005, a question of whether the material was being used by anyone any more.

The commentator, a certifier from the upper Midwest, stated that they had never been asked about the material by any fruit growers, and suggested that it may be removed from the list. The material was deferred in order to find out if the material is still used by any organic operations.

Subsequent Crops Committee contact with the Washington State Organic Program, the certifier in the largest tree fruit growing region in the U.S., discovered that it is used as a flotation agent by approximately two-thirds of their certified growers, who use these type of materials.

The other one-third is currently using lignin sulfonate. The actual number of growers in their program that are using either material was not disclosed. The contact at the Washington program stated that these

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	growers would like to continue using the
2	materials, which are used to float pears.
3	Some public comment was received by
4	the committee, verbal comments from subsequent
5	contacts with some of these growers that the
6	Washington program alerted us to, and they
7	repeated the same feeling that "Yeah, we need
8	a flotation agent. We'd like them to keep
9	being on the list."
10	So the Crops Committee recommended
11	renewing the following material to the use
12	category as floating agents in post-harvest
13	handling, sodium silicate. Discussion?
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So in this case,
15	Gerry, do I understand that we have two
16	substances that do the same thing?
17	MEMBER DAVIS: Yeah.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Is there a
19	distinction between the people who are using
20	sodium silicate and those who couldn't use
21	lignin sulfonate?
22	MEMBER DAVIS: I didn't pick up on

that at all. I think possibly. I mean I could be speaking out of turn, but it did seem to me -
CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I mean, to me this

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I mean, to me this is a case where maybe you have two items that do the same function. But I'm not sure if we have that level of knowledge here to make that decision. But that would be my concern.

MEMBER DAVIS: And I don't know if there are any of the tree fruit growers from the West Coast here, that would use these kind of materials. That might be kind of a longshot, because it's pretty specialized usage.

Perhaps the fact that the lignin sulfonate has so many more uses, and could be used as a flotation agent. That might cause the board to lean towards removing it. But we'd have to change it, a lot of things.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well for me, it's just a question, because I'm not going to shoot from the hip on something. But it just

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	seems like we have two materials that do the
2	same thing, and it sounds like if they don't
3	use one, they could use the other, and it's
4	just a question. Joe?
5	MEMBER SMILLIE: I might have some
6	more information after lunch. I've, you know,
7	contacted WSDA and hopefully we might be able
8	to answer that, we can get some information on
9	that before we vote.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I think that would
11	be helpful to know.
12	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
13	MEMBER DAVIS: We'll get that.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
15	MEMBER KARREMAN: At voting time, do
16	we still have some discussion? Like when the
17	motion is made
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. There will
19	be a motion, it will be seconded, discussion,
20	vote.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay, good.
22	MEMBER DAVIS: That's all I have.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
2	MEMBER DAVIS: That concludes the
3	Crops Discussion, yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.
5	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Good job.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Good job.
7	MEMBER KARREMAN: Very good job.
8	(Applause.)
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Got to get back to
10	my agenda, to see who's on the hot seat.
11	MEMBER MOYER: Livestock.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Livestock. Hugh?
13	MEMBER KARREMAN: I'd put you on the
14	hot seat, Gerald, so now it's my turn.
15	MEMBER DAVIS: I'll go easy on you.
16	MEMBER KARREMAN: Hey, whatever it
17	takes.
18	MEMBER DAVIS: Feedback.
19	Livestock Committee Report
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. As acting
21	chair for Livestock right now, since Chairman
22	Lacy (ph) is not here, I've been asked to

present these materials for consideration and discussion at this point.

So the first one is the -- we're looking at synthetic substances allowed for use in organic livestock production under the category use as feed supplements, 205.603(c), 2(c). We're looking at milk replacers.

Okay, committee summary. Several commenters supported the continued listing of milk replacers. One commenter requested the continued listing of non-organic milk replacers, since organic milk replacers or their equivalent are available.

The Livestock Committee agrees with the commenter, who indicated organic milk replacers or their equivalent are available, and thus non-organic milk replacers no longer need to be on the national list.

The Livestock Committee believe milk replacers can be removed from the list without adversely affecting organic livestock production.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	So the committee recommendation,
2	based upon the comments received, we recommend
3	to not renew milk replacers with their
4	annotation, or should I just say milk
5	replacers, since we're not doing annotations?
6	MEMBER CAROE: The listing.
7	MEMBER KARREMAN: The list, leave it
8	as is?
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: As listed.
10	MEMBER CAROE: As listed.
11	MEMBER KARREMAN: As listed, okay.
12	The vote was 4 to 0 and one abstention.
13	Discussion?
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
15	MEMBER CAROE: There seemed to be a
16	lot of public comment on this. Did that bring
17	any new light to your consideration? I mean,
18	I did hear public comment on it, and
19	truthfully, I hadn't been up to speed on your
20	recommendation at that point.
21	But did the commenters that gave
22	public testimony give you any new information

1	or any reason to reconsider your committee
2	decision?
3	MEMBER KARREMAN: I don't think so.
4	I can tell you that some comments that were
5	received by me at farmer's meetings across the
6	country clearly indicated that there was no
7	need for it.
8	That's directly from dairy farmers,
9	overwhelmingly like because regular milk, kind
10	of waste milk, is used for calves on organic
11	dairy farms.
12	MEMBER CAROE: Okay. Well, I guess
13	
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, okay. I saw
15	you Nancy.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
17	MEMBER OSTIGUY: At least my
18	understanding of the comments was "Well gosh,
19	don't take it off the list because we might
20	need it, maybe. I'm not sure though."
21	That seemed to be what Jim was
22	saying, and then the subsequent comments were

"Well yeah, we were going to say it was okay to take it off the list. But since Jim said maybe we should keep it, we'll go long with that."

So there really didn't seem to be much information, other than "Well, should we take it off the list, because if we do, then if we need it, we won't have it," and it didn't seem to have a use.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I've got Julie,
Dan, Joe.

MEMBER WEISMAN: It was PCO, Pennsylvania Certified Organic, did address this issue in their comments that were read yesterday, and it seems like they do continue to receive requests for the emergency use of milk replacer and approve it when they agree that it's necessary. They say that there are not organic equivalents available in their region.

MEMBER KARREMAN: I would ask -- I would like to know and maybe Leslie in here,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	what
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: Actually, I think
3	Emily signed this comment.
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well whoever from
5	PCO
6	MEMBER WEISMAN: Could Emily speak
7	to this?
8	MEMBER KARREMAN:what the
9	emergency uses were for, because to like I
10	mentioned yesterday, emergency is an unplanned
11	event requiring immediate attention. Usually,
12	when you have to go to certifier and ask
13	things, it takes a little while.
14	So I'm kind of wondering what the
15	emergency use was. Someone from PCO in here?
16	EB: Yes.
17	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. Emily's
18	coming.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: We'll ask Emily to
20	come up to respond to that, but before as
21	you're coming up, Dan?
22	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Being on the

Livestock Committee, my feeling was uncertain at first. I did go along with the vote. In the public comment that did ask for it to be retained, PCO and also Kelly Shea, I believe, requested that it stay on.

The discussions in the committee was that we couldn't see an emergency use that justified it, so why not take it off? In light of the public comment, I go kind of back to my original feeling. Whereas since it does have such a restricted annotation, there's no harm in having it on there.

For the emergency situation, even if it's a case where the power went out for three hours in the morning and the truck came before the guy could get the calf milk out of the tank, and something else was going on and they couldn't -- didn't feed the calves in time that day, I know there are --

The vast majority of commercial milk replacers on the market probably do contain BST, but I know there are communities and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	markets where the processor restricts and does
2	not allow the use of BST.
3	A lot of those do offer their
4	producers the opportunity of buying whole milk
5	powder, and that would not have BST in it. So
6	in light of all that information, I'll be
7	changing my vote this afternoon.
8	MEMBER KARREMAN: However, that's
9	milk powder. That's not necessarily milk
10	replacer, and maybe we need to have a
11	definition of what milk replacer is.
12	Because milk powder I mean milk
13	replacer is, you know, can be conjured up in
14	many different ways.
15	MEMBER WEISMAN: Right.
16	MEMBER KARREMAN: But milk powder is
17	different. I mean that's just powder with
18	milk power and water. I don't know if that's
19	really replacer or not.
20	(Simultaneous Discussion.)
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Emily, for the
22	record.

MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Oh, my name? Emily Brown-Rosen from Pennsylvania Certified Organic. I put this comment in because we do get requests from farmers, and we are asked to review products that are milk replacers.

For a long time, there was never one that was acceptable that was identified. But we recently identified one that is, and the ingredients seemed to be acceptable.

So I agree, it would be a very rare use that would be -- that they wouldn't be able to use organic milk. There would have to be some extreme situation. So we allow it on a case by case -- you know, they have to individually get approval every time they want to use it, and we have to document the emergency.

So what I had put in here was such things as mother dies during birth, somehow there's no other milk available, some kind of big disease outbreak, rabies, fires, you know. It would be real extreme that would be the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	emergency.
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: Just quick. Do
3	they is it usually, do they ask before they
4	use it or after they use it?
5	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: They're supposed
6	to ask before. Yeah, if they used something
7	afterwards
8	MEMBER KARREMAN: That's what
9	they're supposed to do.
10	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Yeah, yeah. Joe?
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, I need
12	clarification on a couple of points. If we
13	approve the continued use of milk replacer,
14	can we put these restrictions on, that it
15	doesn't contain all of the things that we
16	heard so much about the last two days from the
17	dairy community, that they want a real strong
18	organic law and walk the extra mile and all
19	that stuff we heard.
20	Then we're going to allow a milk
21	replacer that contravenes it because it has a

number of ingredients that are --

1	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Yes, but why is it
2	synthetic is the question? I mean, you know,
3	we looked at this. On the list is the
4	synthetic, and what do we do? I review
5	products.
6	You know, so we've seen some that
7	come in with animal fat, blood, amino acids
8	and I've said no. But you know, the other
9	ones we've had but there's not real clear
10	guidance for that, other than that they're
11	otherwise prohibited in the rule, you know.
12	MEMBER SMILLIE: But we can't vote
13	on that. We can only vote to continue
14	allowing that material that you just quoted
15	with all the no-nos in it, or nothing, right?
16	Is that correct?
17	MEMBER KARREMAN: That's correct.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Or if it's
19	continued, you can come back, somebody can
20	file a petition for an annotation, and then
21	these can be addressed in committee.

MEMBER SMILLIE: My second question

1	is milk from the tank considered milk replacer
2	instead of powdered milk?
3	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well that's
4	interesting. I mean no. I mean that's milk
5	from a tank. That's organic milk, and that's
6	actually what the farmers I was talking to
7	across the country, they all either use
8	hospital milk or milk they wouldn't put in the
9	tank for whatever reason, or tank milk
10	basically.
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: Wouldn't be more
12	available on an organic dairy farm than a
13	synthetic milk replacer?
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: Except in the
15	conditions that Emily had just stated, like
16	salmonella, barn fire, whatever.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
18	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes. The reason
19	Hugh had that response from all the farmers in
20	the country is because there is no need for
21	milk replacer in an organic dairy. The OFPA
22	requires organic feed from the last third of

gestation.

If a farmer has a problem with a death at birth, there's always organic milk available on a dairy farm. You milk at least twice a day, and there's no reason milk can't be taken out of the tank.

If an animal dies at birth, we always keep frozen colostrum on hand. We can thaw out and feed that animal, and there's just no way to say that there is an emergency need for milk replacer on an organic dairy.

It just -- it won't happen. You'd have to -- you know, if you are fighting a disease on your dairy farm, you can pasteurize the milk simply by doing it on your kitchen stove. You don't need to purchase any major piece of equipment.

You can -- if you have a disease outbreak, you'll be testing your animals, segregating those cows that do have that disease that can be transmitted to the cows, and you will also have other organic milk

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	available to feed.
2	You can go to a neighboring organic
3	farm if need be and get milk, buy milk from
4	them. But conventional milk replacers simply
5	have no need or no place on an organic dairy
6	farm, period.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea and Nancy, and
8	then Emily.
9	MEMBER JAMES: I have a question.
10	What percentage I mean it's probably such
11	a minuscule percentage what percentage over
12	a year would a dairy farm, and maybe Jim
13	Pierce might be able to answer this or
14	somebody else, would somebody actually use a
15	milk replacer? I mean
16	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Kevin could answer
17	that. It's like six weeks or seven, less than
18	that, if you were going to use a milk
19	replacer?
20	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Like what, for
21	standard, bringing up a calf?

MEMBER OSTIGUY: For a calf, yes.

1	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
2	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Well, wait a
3	second. This is only for emergencies. This
4	is not for regular like feeding calves.
5	MEMBER JAMES: Right. So I mean how
6	much milk replacer, how many emergency
7	situations are there where a dairy would
8	actually I mean, there will probably be
9	years that could go by that you wouldn't even
10	need to use it?
11	MEMBER KARREMAN: Can I just answer
12	once here Kevin?
13	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Sure.
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: I get onto 80
15	certified farms down in Lancaster County. I
16	never see bags of milk replacer.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
18	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Kevin, this is a
19	question for you. You said that there's never
20	a reason, and I'm ignorant about dairy farms.
21	Would the barn fire be a situation where you
22	might end up needing something, or would there

1	still be other options?
2	MEMBER ENGELBERT: You will still be
3	milking your cows somewhere.
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Okay.
5	MEMBER ENGELBERT: That's a
6	hardship, there's no question about it. But
7	you're still going to have organic milk
8	available from your herd.
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: And it's true.
10	You've got to milk those cows.
11	MEMBER ENGELBERT: And you hope you
12	don't lose the cow. And if you do, you're done
13	or you go to a neighboring farm. You know,
14	and then you'll have to develop a plan. But
15	there is no reason for it.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: While Emily is
17	here, are there any other comments, questions
18	for Emily, or Emily, do you have anything in
19	final?
20	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: The only point I
21	would like to make is we do get requests
22	because of Johnes disease, and I know that,

1	you know, we've struggled with that. I know
2	Hugh doesn't think that's a valid excuse,
3	because it's such a long-term disease to have
4	to fight.
5	You have to have a long management
6	plan to gradually reduce it. So if you have
7	Johnes without severe restriction, you would
8	be continually feeding.
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: Right. Can I add
10	to that?
11	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: So that but I
12	think that's what some farmers would like it
13	for.
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. Is that the
15	main reason that they ask you?
16	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: But I think that's
17	probably the main reason they're asking, but
18	we haven't granted it for that.
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. Not to talk
20	about Johnes too much, but they should be
21	testing their herds, and just simply not
22	feeding calves milk from those cows that are

positive for Johnes. That's part of the management.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Right, and to add to that, we've had two farms in New York State that have had severe outbreaks of Johnes. Their certifier did not allow them to purchase milk replacer, and they have beaten the disease without it, just by careful management, testing their cows, segregating that milk and being very careful how they do things. They did not have to have milk replacer to get a handle on that disease.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Thank you, Emily. I think that's been discussed. Thank you, Hugh. Next.

MEMBER KARREMAN: One down, three to go. I think. There's one on the back. One's hiding, okay. The next one is for chlorine under 205.603, synthetic substances allowed for use in organic livestock production, category use (a) as disinfectant, sanitizer and medical treatments as applicable.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hydrated lime?
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: No. Oh, I'm
3	sorry.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Actually, I'm just
5	keeping the order of the sunset.
6	(Pause.)
7	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. You raised
8	that from the record, I guess. No, okay.
9	We'll start over for hydrated lime, sorry.
10	Under 205.603, synthetic substances
11	allowed for use in organic livestock
12	production, category use (b) as topical
13	treatment, external parasiticide or local
14	anesthetic, as a
15	Okay. This is for hydrated lime.
16	The committee summary was that several
17	commentators supported the continued listing
18	of hydrated lime.
19	One commentator objected to the
20	continued listing of hydrated lime, stating it
21	is too harsh of a chemical to allow for direct
22	contact with animals, as pest control agent,

1	and it is hazardous to the humans who handle
2	it.
3	The committee agrees with the
4	commentator recommending that removal of
5	hydrated lime from the national list. The
6	Livestock Committee believes that there are
7	alternatives to hydrated lime, and that the
8	substance can be removed from the list without
9	adversely impacting organic livestock
10	production.
11	Therefore, the committee
12	recommendation was that the committee
13	recommends not renewing the following
14	substance of lime, hydrated, as listed. It
15	was a vote of 6 to remove it, zero to keep it.
16	Discussion?
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Just
18	MEMBER KARREMAN: I'm sorry. Go
19	ahead.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: A question. in
21	terms of we had a lot of public comment
2.2	vesterday, discussing the need for hydrated

lime, one, what are the alternatives and do they address the public comment concerns for taking it off the list --

MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, I agree. There was a lot of public comment, and as the listening body to the public as the NOSB, we have to take that into account. I certainly have and we need to discuss this topic, I think at lunch time as the Livestock Committee.

One of the alternatives would be simply regular old lime that's not hydrated lime. I was asked by Mike Lacy to ask veterinarians, just in an open question, what's hydrated lime used for, so we would get a take on it as far as for health type and welfare considerations.

It was an open question to 1,700 veterinarians on my list serve. I think I got 35 replies or so, and basically, hydrated lime is used as a pH adjustment for the bedding of livestock, generally near the udder, to adjust

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the pH so microbes find it not so good to live in the bedding and therefore reduce mastitis potential.

You could use regular lime as well, but the pH adjustment is not as radical or as strong. That would be an alternative, regular calcium oxide from the field, or quarried lime like that.

I don't think it's as efficacious, but I think part of the problem with the hydrated lime -- well, not part of the problem, but I think one of th reasons it's synthetic is because of the way it's produced.

In its production, there are certain toxic substances that would be harmful to the workers that are producing it. I think that's under one of the OFPA considerations of the seven points to look at a synthetic.

However, listening to the board today, we are not here to re-review the material in its entirety; just to see if it's truly to be needed in production. So we can

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	go to Jeff. How's that?
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
3	MEMBER KARREMAN: Or I'm sorry,
4	Nancy.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy, then
6	Arthur, and then Jeff.
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: One of the
8	commenters yesterday mentioned hydrated lime
9	being in the material that the barns are
LO	painted with?
L1	MEMBER KARREMAN: Whitewash.
L2	MEMBER SMILLIE: That's what I was
L3	going to bring up.
L4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: What, and I'm
L5	assuming from what his description was this
L6	was a public health issue and required. If we
L7	took it off the list, does that work?
L8	MEMBER KARREMAN: As I said, I think
L9	from the public comments yesterday, we need to
20	discuss this at lunch, and I do agree that
21	there's public health ramifications that we
22	need to strongly consider that. I didn't know

it was used in whitewash.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur?

MR. NEAL: Looking the at recommendation, I think we'd have some concerns over the justification. Ιt lists that the committee agrees with the commenter recommending removal of hydrated lime from the national list.

One of the questions that I would have is why does the committee agree with the commenter? If we're going to remove it, what are going to be the alternatives in place of it, because we do have the procedure that was published in the Federal Register, that says that if we're going to remove something, we're definitely going to have to identify the alternative that replaces it, because we need that for the record.

Just to comment on re-reviewing the substance, I mean what are you all doing? You're already re-reviewing a substance. The only difference is that in -- if you renew the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

substance, you would not change the way that the substance is listed through this process.

If you remove -- you could

potentially remove a substance. That is rereviewing a substance. But in renewing a
substance, you would not change annotation or
the way that it was listed.

Just as you are recommending in this particular recommendation to remove it, that is re-reviewing a substance. If you remove the substance, you really do have to justify you're removing it, in why terms of alternatives, why with you agree the commenters and things of that nature.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I have Jeff and then Dan.

MEMBER MOYER: Yeah. I was iust going to in terms of the barn say whitewashing, I don't think that relevant in terms of the way this is defined being used, Because don't as dictate what they paint their barn with or

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

anything else.

That barn treatment is strictly -if we're going to get into that, then we have
to look at what other substitutes that we use
for whitewashing, even if it's an oil-based
paint or something with a thin --

I mean as a committee, we don't have jurisdiction over what they paint their barn with on the inside.

MEMBER KARREMAN: I guess you could say cattle could rub up against the walls, and therefore it's a topical as it is mentioned in here. But you know, that's hit and miss.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: One of the things that did come up in our discussion that I just noticed that it wasn't in there, I believe last night when I was looking at this again, was a discussion of a contamination of the hydrated lime in the manure and the complications that that creates in putting that manure out on the fields.

In light of what Gerald said

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

earlier, I'm not sure that the general amount 1 2 and concentration of that hydrated lime in the manure would be enough to violate the problem 3 of putting that manure out. 4 5 So that was one -- that was part of our discussion, Arthur, that didn't quite make 6 7 it into the recommendation. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea? 8 Going back to 9 MEMBER JAMES: Yes. the whitewash. However, it's stated, Starr 10 11 Curtis mentioned that the whitewash was used as an antibacterial, to help reduce pests on 12 walls and so wouldn't that be something that 13 would be taken into consideration? 14 Because if we look at how they clean 15 16 their barns and how they deal disinfecting --17 18 MEMBER MOYER: Can I comment? MEMBER KARREMAN: 19 Yes. 20 MEMBER MOYER: mean they used Ι 21 whitewash because it's cheap. It's really

inexpensive. They have to paint the barn with

something in order to keep it clean and sanitized. That's true. So what he was saying is absolutely correct. They tend to use whitewash because it's very inexpensive.

They do have to recoat the barn -it's easier to recoat the barn with this
periodically than it is to repaint the barn,
because you have to do it fairly often because
barns get flies and other things that make it
dirty. So it's inexpensive to do every two or
three years.

# CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?

MEMBER JAMES: The comment was also that using an alternative would be more toxic to the animals.

MEMBER MOYER: Well, that's what I'm saying. We're not in the -- this doesn't stop you from using it on your barn. If we took it off the list here as a topical treatment on cattle, it does not preclude you from using it to treat the barn. They could still do that. That's my understanding, but I've been

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	looking for clarification.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur.
3	MR. NEAL: That's what I was going
4	to comment on. This listing is as a topical
5	treatment, external parasiticide or local
6	anesthetic. This is not facility or pest
7	management.
8	MEMBER MOYER: Right.
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. So then if
10	it's used in the bedding, that's in the
11	that's not a topical treatment either.
12	MR. NEAL: Well, what I heard
13	earlier was whitewashing a barn.
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: Right.
15	MEMBER MOYER: To get rid of animal
16	waste.
17	MR. NEAL: If we're talking about,
18	let's see, external pest control for the
19	bedding. Yes, that would matter.
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, Kevin.
21	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Why is that
22	Arthur? I mean, the main use of this as a

deodorizer, deodorizing animal waste is often in, as I've seen it used, in tie stall barns and things where they put a pretty good coat of it behind the cows, to try and keep the overall ammonia levels down.

The use that we're discussing would be putting it at the back of a free stall, to alter the pH, to have a bacterial effect on the cow getting mastitis. Is that a difference?

MEMBER KARREMAN: Just for the record, Dan, in the tie stalls it's used for the exact same way as in the free stalls for the bedding. I've never seen farmers use it to deodorize animal waste, okay.

As a matter of fact, the only two things I've ever seen, the hydrated lime used for, as a practitioner out there is in the bedding, you know, behind the cow for the mastitis control, or in a box as a powder, where they walk through a topical treatment for the hoof.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

You know, I don't see where it ever 1 2 is under external parasiticide or the other, local anesthetic. But that's the only two 3 things I've ever seen hydrated lime used for, 4 5 and I quess whitewash. MEMBER GIACOMINI: That's what I'm 6 7 asking Arthur. Is, granted that use in the box is topical treatment and that's covered. 8 Is the use in the bedding covered in this? 9 The way that I'm looking 10 MR. NEAL: 11 at it is that if you're trying to prevent pest infestation of the animal through the bedding, 12 and it is an external application. It may not 13 be applying it directly to the animal, but 14 you're externally trying to prevent 15 infestation of that animal from the bedding. 16 I would, Arthur, 17 MEMBER KARREMAN: 18 look at that as а I would take that literally when I see topical treatment as a 19 20 veterinarian. I see that applied directly to

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

the animal, not just in its environment.

would say that in the bedding

21

wouldn't be a topical treatment technically. 1 Emily, would you 2 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: like to come up and make a comment. 3 you were the one that submitted comments on 4 5 the topical hoof treatment and --MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Thanks. This is 6 7 Emily Brown-Rosen again. Yes, Pennsylvania farmers do use it as a hoof treatment, as a 8 walk-through box. We don't allow it -- it's 9 allowed in bedding because 10 then 11 bedding commonly gets used in the ground, and then it has synthetic fertilizer and it would 12 be prohibited. 13 That, I believe, was the reason for 14 the original NOSB annotation, not to be used 15 16 to deodorize manure because then it would be in the manure and being applied the soil 17 18 somewhere. So that, I think, was the intent of that whole use. 19 20 It's not registered as a pesticide, 21 so we didn't find anyone -- no one's requested

to use it as a parasiticide. But it is used

1	just for the hoof treatment. It's an
2	alternative to copper sulfate.
3	Copper is, you know, a heavy metal
4	and so in that sense it's more benign in the
5	environment than copper would be. Then you
6	also have situations in the winter where
7	copper sulfate is a supplied liquid, where
8	that might be tricky to apply.
9	But so we do have it we're using
10	it for foot rot and hairy hoof work.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. From your
12	earlier conversation, you wanted to take this
13	back in committee?
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And have you had
16	enough discussion here or are there other
17	questions from the committee?
18	MEMBER ENGELBERT: I have one
19	question. Have any of those farms used just
20	plain lime, powdered lime, and what have the
21	results been/
22	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Well, it's been on

1	the list, so we've allowed it. The literature
2	shows it's more effective, you know, as an
3	antibacterial drying agent. But you know, you
4	could use that. I don't know its
5	effectiveness.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: And one last
7	thing, as far as it being applied to the land,
8	I do believe an organic farmer is allowed to
9	buy in conventional manure and apply it to the
LO	land.
L1	So I can't see why, you know, a
L2	little bit of hydrated lime. It kind of gets
L3	to some other discussions we were having
L4	previously, but I don't see how that would
L5	affect
L6	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: But a little bit
L7	of pesticide too. I mean, you
L8	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay, okay, okay.
L9	(Laughter.)
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Thank you,
21	Emily. Hugh, you want to move on?
22	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yep, sure. Okay.

Where are we on two? Which one? Chlorine.

I have like two -- I've got three different chlorines. It's all repetitive. Okay. Oh, I see. Okay.

We had to review chlorine for three different -- no, I'm just -- okay, sorry. For 205.603, synthetic substances allowed for use in organic livestock production, category use (a) as disinfectant, sanitizer, medical treatments as applicable, we looked at chlorine.

The committee summary was -- we looked at a lot of some specific comments, and several commenters say that chlorine materials, such as calcium hypochloride and chlorine dioxide and sodium hypochloride should remain on the list.

Some commenters stated that the chlorine materials just mentioned should be list. removed from the The Livestock Committee agrees with the commenters supported the renewal of chlorine materials,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

calcium hypochloride, chlorine dioxide and sodium hypochloride because their use is considered essential for organic livestock production. They can be used in a way compatible with organic production practices.

So based upon the comments received, we recommended the renewal of chlorine materials as listed, and the vote was 6 in favor and 0 opposed. Discussion?

(Pause.)

MEMBER KARREMAN: Do I say it?

Okay, I don't see any discussion, so should we move on? Okay. Got it. Okay.

The next one for 205.603 synthetic substances allowed for use in organic livestock production, category use (a) as disinfectant, sanitizer and medical treatments as applicable, we looked at oxytocin, and we received, you know, comments on it.

Several commenters stated that oxytocin should remain on the list. Some commenters stated oxytocin should be removed.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	The committee agrees with the commenters who
2	supported the renewal of oxytocin, Because it
3	is its use is considered not harmful to
4	humans or the environment.
5	It is considered essential in
6	assuring the health and welfare of organic
7	livestock, and it can be used in a way
8	compatible with organic production practices.
9	So based on the comments received
10	we, as a committee, recommended the renewal of
11	oxytocin as listed, and the vote was 5 in
12	favor of renewal, zero opposed, and one
13	abstention. Discussion?
14	(Pause.)
15	MEMBER DAVIS: I had a question.
16	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
17	MEMBER DAVIS: This usage, where it
18	says "use in post-parturition therapeutic
19	applications," is it used for just certain
20	individual cows that seem to have a problem
21	and need to have

KARREMAN:

MEMBER

22

Yes. It's

1	definitely only allowed in this well first,
2	that's an annotation. But to explain it, how
3	it's used, only for emergency use and it would
4	be used by veterinarians when called in to
5	for an emergency, which is a serious
6	emergency when the uterus of the cow comes out
7	after the calf does, and you have to put the
8	uterus back in. It's a major procedure.
9	Then you would give a shot of
10	oxytocin, about 5 cc's, to reduce or contract
11	the uterus rapidly, so it will not just flop
12	out again. Oxytocin is a nine amino acid
13	sequence, and it degrades in about 30 seconds.
14	So you would use it one time, maybe
15	two times in the first day or two after
16	calving.
17	MEMBER DAVIS: Thanks. Thanks for
18	the background.
19	MEMBER ENGELBERT: And I abstained
20	because it can only be used with a vet's
21	recommendation, and the vet has to be there to

It's not something a farmer has

administer.

1	on hand and can just randomly give to his
2	cows.
3	Otherwise, I would have voted
4	against it as not necessary or essential. But
5	there may be a case every now and then where
6	you have to call in a vet and it has to be
7	administered to save that cow.
8	MEMBER GIACOMINI: The problem is
9	that it is a hormone.
10	HH Right. That's the problem.
11	However, under OFPA the subtherapeutic use of
12	antibiotics and hormones for growth promotion
13	are prohibited, and this is absolutely not
14	such a use. It's a therapeutic use in
15	emergency situations to relieve pain and
16	suffering for animal welfare. Jeff?
17	MEMBER MOYER: Hugh, can you in 30
18	seconds or so tell us what happens to the milk
19	of that cow then, just for the record?
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well actually, on
21	a conventional farm there is no withholding

for oxytocin Because

time

22

rapid

of the

1	breakdown, and because all mammals produce
2	oxytocin. The synthetic version available in
3	a bottle for therapeutic application has zero
4	withholding time required for meter milk by
5	the FDA, Center for Veterinary Medicine.
6	You know, first of all, when it's
7	used on the first day of lactation or at
8	calving like that, legally farmers have to
9	hold the milk out for, I believe it's five to
10	six days.
11	Most farmers don't do that, but so
12	you'd be holding the milk out for a few days
13	anyway, even though there's zero withholding
14	time.
15	Any more discussion or questions?
16	MEMBER JAMES: Hugh, what would
17	happen I mean besides this, what are the
18	chances of a cow dying without it?
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, it depends
20	what it would be used for. If it's for a
21	prolapsed uterus and you put it back in and

to give oxytocin to get

you

want

22

rapid

1	contraction of the uterus and you don't, it
2	could flop back out and that's not good if it
3	comes out again, externally of the body.
4	That's a no-brainer. It's no good the first
5	time.
6	We did have a TAP review on this. I
7	think was this a new TAP review, Arthur or
8	MR. NEAL: Yes, yes.
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: And there were no
10	good alternatives for it in the alternative
11	realm. Another reason you might use it is for
12	a uterine hemorrhage, if there is a rip in the
13	uterus and there's a vessel that's cut and I
14	can't stitch it.
15	It would be used for that purpose as
16	well. So at that point, the animal could
17	actually die by not using it.
18	MEMBER GIACOMINI: I think if you
19	didn't use it in the other case, the essential
20	effect would be death also.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: Oh yes, yes. That

22

would be malpractice.

1	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: All right. Moving
3	along.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Movin' along.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Movin' along,
6	okay. Ivermectin. There we are. Okay.
7	205.603, synthetic substances allowed for use
8	in organic livestock production, category use
9	(a) as disinfectant, sanitizer and medical
10	treatments as applicable.
11	We looked Ivermectin and a number of
12	commenters stated that Ivermectin should
13	remain on the list. Some commenters stated
14	that it should be removed.
15	The Livestock Committee agreed with
16	the commenters who supported the renewal,
17	because its use is considered essential for
18	the health and welfare of organic livestock at
19	this time, and can be used in a way compatible
20	with organic production practices.
21	Based upon comments received, the
22	Livestock Committee recommends the renewal of

1	the following substance. Parasiticides,
2	Ivermectin as listed. The committee vote was
3	5 in favor, 1 opposed, no abstentions.
4	MEMBER WEISMAN: Can we hear the
5	minority?
6	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes, you may. I
7	think that it is an unnecessary product for
8	organic production.
9	I think that if a farm has a severe
10	infestation of parasites, that's an indication
11	that there's a severe problem with their
12	operation, and there are other available
13	substances, such as Moxidectin and other
14	products that could be used.
15	But the studies still are
16	inconclusive about their total effectiveness.
17	But I just I'm against this type of
18	substance being allowed in organic practice.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh.
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: This is only to be
21	used as an emergency for a condition diagnosed
22	by a veterinarian.

It cannot be used, you know, routinely, and on the farms that I'm working with for the last ten years, you know, you have young stock, ages between like just past weaning up to about ten months old that seem to be the ones that get potentially infested.

We certainly do run fecal samples on them, and it's only the two out of ten animals that would receive the Ivermectin treatment, and it is only used one time. It's somewhat like the thing with the oxytocin we just talked about.

It's kind of a one-time treatment, and I truly believe it is for the health and welfare of those animals, and without a doubt, at least in my practice, I always educate the farmers on management practices that will reduce the need for it later.

I would say also that because of all the prohibitions in the organic industry, I do a lot of studying for alternative substances for prohibited materials, and there is a lot

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

of research coming out now regarding  $in\ vitro$  and some  $in\ vivo$  studies with botanical treatments against parasites.

They're based in mainly in sheep and goats, but you could extrapolate cattle. Regarding diatomaceous earth, I've never seen it work in an actual infestation. It may work for keeping things in equilibrium.

So I would say that, you know, Ivermectin is used so infrequently, at least it should be by the annotation, that I don't see it as a problem to the environment as such, and I -- anyway. Go ahead, Bea.

MEMBER JAMES: What about the comments from Emily regarding Ivermectin being persistent in the manure and having an impact on soil?

MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, but keep -in the context of what I was just saying, if I
treat two animals, I'll just say, out of ten,
which would be on average, just from my
experience, that's two animals, two little

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

	calves out of ten out of a herd of, I don't
2	know, maybe 80 animals on that farm.
3	I don't believe that the manure from
4	those two little animals, that little amount,
5	will affect the environment, compared the 88
6	other animals or whatever. And it's a one-
7	time treatment.
8	MEMBER JAMES: What about two little
9	animals all over everywhere, on lots of
10	different farms over time?
11	MEMBER KARREMAN: That's a good
12	point. However, it is not being used
13	routinely. I think that's where I make the
14	distinction.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
16	MEMBER OSTIGUY: We've actually had
17	a lot of discussion about Ivermectin,
17 18	a lot of discussion about Ivermectin, especially when Moxidectin came up.
18	especially when Moxidectin came up.

One of the things that I have this

1	vague memory of, and maybe someone can recall
2	better than I do, there were some questions at
3	one point about a material that was on the
4	list, that we were using in a way that has not
5	been approved by FDA. Was this Ivermectin?
6	Is it Ivermectin?
7	MEMBER KARREMAN: It could be a lot
8	of things.
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: But Actually Arthur
10	can answer probably.
11	MR. NEAL: He already knows what the
12	issue is. The issue is not that there was
13	it's being used inappropriately from FDA
14	perspective.
15	The issue is that I think in October
16	2004 or 2003, I can't remember the exact date,
17	the NOSB requested that the NOP take a
18	position that antibiotics cannot be used in
19	livestock production.
20	Ivermectin, as well as Moxidectin,
21	are technically classified as
22	macroantibiotics, though they function as

parasiticides.

As I write up this particular material, let's say if it is renewed, when I write it up, I'm going to give this description. In this description it will say it is a macroantibiotic.

I'll also talk about how it functions as a parasiticide, however.

My concern is that USDA has taken a position that antibiotics are prohibited. How does this recommendation coincide or correlate to our position?

If it is going to be renewed, the only thing that I ask is either the NOSB provide us some type of justification as to how this relates to our current position, and how this substance is different.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?

MEMBER CAROE: Well, I don't want to take us off track, but going back to the comment about the persistence in the soil, it seems to me that Emily's comment for PCO was

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	related to the slowly-released formulas, which
2	I believe you said is not available. The
3	formulas are not even available any more?
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: That's correct.
5	MEMBER CAROE: So the persistence in
6	the environment is not a big issue, as big an
7	issue as it was when this was first listed
8	anyways?
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: May I answer that,
10	Kevin?
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes.
12	MEMBER KARREMAN: The slow release
13	formulation has been taken off the market. It
14	was not a profitable item for whichever
15	company. That was, however, strictly
16	prohibited I believe, somewhere in the
17	annotation, if I remember. If I'm wrong, it
18	doesn't matter. It's not on the market.
19	Now as far as I know that we will
20	have a public comment at some point by a
21	veterinarian who's here. He will discuss this

we're talking about.

I do believe we also have to consider perhaps using the term "anthomentic" for this product, rather than anything else, because that is functionally what it is.

Okay, you know, the fine print on the company label might say it's a microcylic lactone antibiotic in fine print, but I guarantee you in veterinary school, no one learns that. That is not discussed. That's a pure, very purist chemical interpretation or whatever. Go ahead, Nancy.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I actually agree with Arthur a lot, that we do need to have a discussion at some point about the substances that are chemically antibiotic, and do we wish to say no antibiotic use at all, and then in that case, we may not have a choice but to include things like Ivermectin and Moxidectin.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Moxidectin.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Moxidectin, and a material that I'm interested in potentially

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

for beekeeping, naturally derived, technically an antibiotic, used as a fungicide. It's called Fumidil.

But the question then comes, and then also that includes using antibiotics on plants, you know, to go back to the discussion earlier, we need to decide where we stand on that.

Are we talking about therapeutic purposes; are we talking about prophylactic use? Do we want to draw he line with just no, if it chemically is defined as an antibiotic, then we don't even go anywhere near it, or are we okay to use it similarly to how we use it in humans?

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin.

I think one of MEMBER ENGELBERT: the issues there is that antibiotic simply comes down to an issue of definition, and when the definition getting of you start to antibiotic, you start getting into the slippery slope of all the products

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

antibiotic-type effects.

I think that's a very, very slippery slope for us to get into, and I think it's very important for us to deal with this issue in a timely basis, to resolve some of these issues.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy, respond and then Hugh.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Real quickly back.

I agree. We need to have the discussion.

We're already on that slippery slope, in that
that is exactly -- antibiotic use is exactly
what all the chlorine materials are. We are
killing bacteria.

MEMBER KARREMAN: I think we need to maybe have definitions drawn up and officially recognized and received regarding terms such as "germicide," "antimicrobial," "antibacterial," "antiseptic," "antibiotic." We need to have them for the record to use in our deliberations in the future. Peroxide would be included too.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Right. All of
2	those.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I think that's a
4	very good point, Hugh. Does that end your
5	presentation from Livestock?
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: I hope so. I
7	think so.
8	(Applause.)
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: As everybody in
10	the room can see, we're a little off schedule.
11	The public comment period that was scheduled
12	for 11:00, the purpose of that public comment
13	period is to follow our discussion, which we
14	haven't concluded.
15	So we're going to continue with our
16	discussion, and then the public comment period
17	will follow. We had to wait for you all
18	yesterday, so now you're going to wait for us
19	today, as we get our work done.
20	So but we do need to take a break,
21	so I'd like to take a ten minute break if we
22	can, and get back here and get back to the

Handling Committee report. Thank you.
(Whereupon, a short recess was
taken.)
CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The board will
continue its business, so if you could either
take the conversations outside or be seated
please. Thank you.
(Pause.)
CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. We're going
to pick up with the Handling Committee report.
Julie?
Julie? <u>Handling Committee Report</u>
Handling Committee Report
Handling Committee Report  MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. We had
Handling Committee Report  MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. We had several materials that had been deferred, that
Handling Committee Report  MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. We had several materials that had been deferred, that we made recommendations on. So I'll take it
Handling Committee Report  MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. We had several materials that had been deferred, that we made recommendations on. So I'll take it from the top.
Handling Committee Report  MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. We had several materials that had been deferred, that we made recommendations on. So I'll take it from the top.  We actually have, I have the
Handling Committee Report  MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. We had several materials that had been deferred, that we made recommendations on. So I'll take it from the top.  We actually have, I have the recommendation for Section 205.605(a), which

organic specified ingredients or food groups.

161 for non-synthetics that 1 These are are 2 allowed. This recommendations creates colors and flavors. 3 You're not going to see this on the 4 5 screen, but my previous chairs gave reasons initial deferrals 6 for the in their 7 recommendations, which is not included. So I just want to briefly mention 8 that these two items were deferred because 9 they were identified by the Handling Committee 10 11 as items which might prove contentious. They were not deferred initially on 12 13 the basis of an public identification, any 14

identification in public comments.

However, after the request for public comment was made prior to the August meeting, many comments recommending the continued allowance of non-synthetic colors and flavors in organic handling were made.

Register notice The Federal the public to provide evidence and address concerns for any substance that they believe

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

should be discontinued, and there were no comments specific to these two substances at that time, against the continuation of either colors or flavors on the list.

There was one comment at that time, expressing concern that colors and flavors had been added to the list without technical review by the NOSB, and Because of this comment, the handling Committee requested and received from the NOP a technical overview of food and color additives on October 14<sup>th</sup> of 2005, in time to write the recommendation for this meeting.

The technical review that was given to us offered no information that would suggest that either non-synthetic colors or flavors are inconsistent with organic practices.

This is a summary of the information that was contained in those reviews. The use of flavoring substances is regulated by the FDA. All flavoring substances, non-synthetic,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

fall into one of two categories.

They are either GRAS, which means generally recognized as safe, and that is for flavor materials. That's a designation that's granted by a panel of technical experts, whose authority is accepted by the FDA.

Or they're considered food additives, and in that case they have been reviewed and approved by the FDA directly. On the color side, there are no GRAS -- there's no system of designating things GRAS for color additives in the same way.

For color additives to obtain approval from the FDA, the manufacturer has to submit a petition to the FDA demonstrating safety of the substance with information including the manufacturing process, stability data, safety studies, toxicity data, all the types of things that we normally ask for in a petition.

So consequently, as a result of the information that we had at the time that this

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

taken, all synthetic flavoring 1 vote was 2 substances and -- I skipped a sentence, sorry. determined that all 3 We synthetic flavoring substances and colors are subject to 4 5 pre-market approval requirements by reviewing bodies. 6 7 So based on this information, Handling Committee recommends the renewal of 8 the following substances in this use category 9 as published in the final rule. A motion was 10 11 made by Kevin O'Rell, second by Joe Smillie. The committee voted unanimously to renew these 12 13 substances. that being said, 14 all received since the publication 15 of this recommendation lots of public comment on both 16 17 colors and flavors. I'm going to ask the 18 chair's help in guiding me if this is not appropriate at this time. 19 20 I wanted to briefly summarize

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

received

I did a survey of the comments

since

that

the comments.

we

have

21

22

this

recommendation
CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Since the
recommendation has been posted.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Was posted.
CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes.
MEMBER WEISMAN: Because I think
it's pertinent.
CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes.
MEMBER WEISMAN: On flavors, 13
additional comments have been received. Of
these 13, six support the continued listing of
flavors, non-synthetic on 205.605(a). Seven
of the comments recommend that they not be
relisted.
I want to say that in six of the
seven comments recommending that they not be
continued, those also included a
recommendation that they be moved to 606.
Now we have had much conversation in
the last day and a half already in this room

there is not going be any petitioning of items

onto a section of the national list other than the one that they appear on now.

So I believe that the commenters who -- those six commenters who recommended not renewing colors were assuming that they would appear elsewhere, colors and flavors -- I'm sorry. We're just talking about flavors -- this is my first time making this presentation, so I'm sorry.

The six people who recommended against the continuation of flavors on 605(a), I believe that they clearly did not appreciate that they could not be added simultaneously to another list.

I am hesitant to interpret their recommendations against relisting as a request for flavors, non-synthetic to disappear from the list altogether. I don't think that was adequately understood by those commenters.

I also -- one of the comments that was against relisting made mention of the fact that flavors were added to the list by the --

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that flavors were not reviewed, and I wanted to mention that we -- that this is erroneous, that flavors are on the list because there was a recommendation by the NOSB and I think it was on October 31<sup>st</sup> of `95 in Austin, Texas.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That's correct.

MEMBER WEISMAN: And it was put up for public comment, and a technical review at that time, and I know that at least -- I can't see today, but I know yesterday several of the people that were on that technical review panel were in this room, at least yesterday.

So that was the -- that's the additional information I wanted to give, based on the public comment on flavors, okay. We have also received numerous comments on colors, since this recommendation was posted on February 1<sup>st</sup>.

Out of 13 clear comments that were received, five support and eight oppose the continued listing of colors on 205.605(a). Of the eight opposing comments, three comments

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

included recommending relisting on 606. So I 1 2 include -- I think of those comments in the same way as I thought of them for flavors. 3 However, the other five cite the 4 5 fact that colors were never recommended by the NOSB to be listed in the first place, did not 6 7 have TAPs or go through public comment. these comments that Ι find troubling, 8 particularly since their -- I have not been 9 able to find any historical evidence in the 10 11 form of past recommendations, meeting minutes, to counter those assertions as I could for 12 13 flavors. 14 If these assertions are correct, it seems -- well, maybe I should -- should I stop 15 here or should I -- this is the time to 16 17 propose to the committee? 18 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Do you want open for Discussion --19 20 MEMBER WEISMAN: Those are the facts 21 on colors, and I think at this point I want to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

open it up for Discussion.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That's fine. 1 2 MEMBER WEISMAN: Kevin. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea? 3 MEMBER CAROE: I just want to -- I 4 5 have the Federal Register notice for sunset in front of me, for comments that do not support 6 7 the continuation of an existing exemption or a listed item. The commenters were asked to 8 demonstrate that the substance was found to be 9 "(1) Not harmful to human health 10 the 11 environment, (2) necessary because unavailability of wholly non-synthetic 12 alternative, and (3) consistent and compatible 13 with organic practices." 14 It also asked for the commenter to 15 provide viable alternatives, such as practices 16 and other substances, and then also to include 17 18 the manufacturers of these substances availability. 19 20 don't think that we've gotten 21 that level of detail from of the any

commenters and, you know, again,

22

as we've

heard from the program, in order for these
things to go up and be taken off the list,
they have to have this level of detail in the
justification.

That's clear in the Federal Register
notice that was -- the commenters were asked
to provide this information. I just don't see

MEMBER WEISMAN: I'm curious if anybody on the board had a chance to read AMRI's comments on colors.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes.

that it's come to us in this format.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay, because Ι think that did include that quite an of detail in impressive amount terms of breaking down the category of colors and the different colors types of t.hat. are manufactured and the practices that are used.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And it is inherent in the problem with having a listing of a generic or general classification of substances, because when you're talking about

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

colors, you're talking about a lot of things out there.

It would certainly help if we had a synthetic non-synthetic document, a guidance document on the table today, because then that could alleviate some of the concerns that were addressed in the AMRI letter.

But there's -- that's one of the things that we have to wrestle with, and I know there have been statements made that they should be individually petitioned. You know, that's quite a list of petition for items that would have to come up.

We have the same issue with flavors, although I don't want to lump them together. But it is again a general category with a lot of compounds that are put together to make flavoring materials. So Bea?

MEMBER JAMES: Julie, I wonder if maybe you could just give comment on what you think about AMRI's point on addressing colors and flavors separately.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER WEISMAN: I think they should
2	be addressed separately.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes, they were.
4	Andrea.
5	MEMBER CAROE: Just a reminder that
6	this material is on 205.605(a), as a non-
7	synthetic, non-agricultural material. I mean
8	in its placement, we're talking about you
9	know, we're not talking about the Concord
LO	grade essence here, Because that would be
L1	agricultural.
L2	Again, this all tied into our non-
L3	synthetic versus synthetic, and our
L4	agricultural versus non-agricultural
L5	arguments. But in its placement, we're not
L6	talking about synthetic forms, and we're not
L7	talking about agricultural forms of flavors
L8	and/or colors.
L9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
20	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I still am curious
21	about the assertion that this was put on the
22	list without a vote of the NOSB. I don't

know, I don't have any information one way or the other. How was it put on?

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur, do you want to respond to that?

MR. NEAL: To my recollection, this material was on the 1997 proposed rule in the -- I wasn't there at the time, so I really don't know how it got added on. It did not appear on the March 2000 proposed rule. It reappeared later.

There were no discussions in the preamble concerning it. So obviously there had been some type of history behind it. I don't exactly know all of it, and I can't explain how it was added to the national list, particularly -- I see Valerie has her hand up.

MS. FRANCES: You know, Tony's out of the room right now, but she was there for all this, and she said it was a mistake it got left out of the 2000 proposed rule. But there was really no comment one way or the other in the preamble addressing it in any way, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	then there was nothing addressing it as a
2	mistake either in the finial rule.
3	MR. NEAL: Right.
4	MS. FRANCES: And having it re-
5	appear.
6	MR. NEAL: And the other thing is
7	that there was no I don't recall the
8	public comment generated as a result of it
9	being on the list at that time.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Zea?
11	MS. SONNEBAND: Thank you for
12	recognizing me. Zea Sonneband, CCOF and the
13	original contractor who got the national list
14	together.
15	Colors was, and flavors were both on
16	the list of materials that were referred by
17	the original NOSB, to go through the TAP
18	process. We had 162 things to take up all at
19	once.
20	So we did them in stages over a
21	period of years, and it involved finding
22	enough scientists who would do the TAP

2 fast they got done. could find 3 We never enough scientists to look at the colors. So there 4 5 was no TAP review done during the period that I was responsible for the list, which was 6 7 through 1996 less. So more or my knowledge, no TAP review has ever been done. 8 9 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: But they were put on by a recommendation from --10 11 MS. SONNEBAND: The NOSB did not discuss it, to my knowledge. I think it came 12 somehow from NOP. Now I haven't been to every 13 I don't remember 14 single meeting, but а conversation about the colors. 15 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kim? 16 Kim Dietz, past NOSB 17 MS. DIETZ: 18 Materials Chair Handling rep. I believe in 2002, when colors did go on the national list, 19 20 like Ι said yesterday, there was 21 recommendation by the board to remove them

procedure on the different materials as to how

Because they had never gone through a TAP and

22

never gone through a board review.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There was a technical recommendation to remove them. They did not get taken off in 2002. So there's no history with colors whatsoever from the NOSB.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Kim.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I guess my next question is how do we deal with this then? If we never actually took a vote, is it a technical correction to remove it and then we have to look at it? Do we have to vote on renewal and petition it? It seems awfully odd to have to do the latter, since we never voted to put it there in the first place.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, we inherited that sin. It's like original sin. I think we've got it, whether we deserve it or not.

So to me, the only and because of the really incredible economic impact that non-renewal would have, I think that basically the procedure would take is to renew it now and immediately start to, you know, get our

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	work done, with a petition immediately
2	following renewal.
3	MEMBER CAROE: It did have a TAP.
4	MEMBER SMILLIE: It was an
5	abbreviated TAP, and from the TAP we did
6	request a technical review. It's not a full
7	TAP that addressed all of the regulation
8	criteria. But we did attempt to fill out the
9	evaluation forms, based on the information we
10	had.
11	We, in filling out those forms, we
12	recognized there were areas where we didn't
13	have answers, and we didn't have answers for
14	several issues on the review form, which does
15	bother me.
16	MS. FRANCES: I'm sorry you don't
17	have the form. I was working with a youngster
18	at the desk last night to print things off,
19	and that, I don't think, got printed off.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, we have it.
21	MS. FRANCES: You have it? I did
22	give it to you?

2	MS. FRANCES: Okay. Somehow I
3	didn't get it then.
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Overview.
5	MS. FRANCES: I'm glad you have it.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yeah, we have the
7	criteria forms here in front of us. But it
8	does show that there are areas that we
9	recognize we don't have the information on,
10	and part of it is in trying to review such a
11	broad class of materials. It's very complex.
12	Then to Joe's point, these are in
13	wide use. They've been on the list for five
14	years. That's why they're coming up for
15	sunset, and they have been used widely in a
16	number of products that are currently on the
17	market.
18	So there is a tremendous economic
19	impact to the industry if it doesn't go
20	forward. But yet we do have a dilemma.
21	Nancy?
22	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Could I make a

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: We have it.

motion to -- maybe we should do this this afternoon, but what I'm thinking -- I'll tell you what I'm thinking and then we can figure out how to do this.

uncomfortable I'm bit with reviewing them as a group, because there are such apples and oranges there. If we do that, then, in the there may be process things reviewing, some that we think actually problematic, and we would review all of that negatively. It would not actually meet the OFPA criteria.

We wouldn't want to have that be held as the standard for the things that would be okay. So would it be possible to, instead of looking at each individual color, because that of course also would be -- might lead to the wrong conclusion that we're after, which is being able to get through this and still allow the industry to continue.

First off yes, we renew. But the recommendation would be then to break up that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	list of colors into similar groupings, so that
2	we could review groups of colors that the
3	answers to the OFPA questions are likely to
4	come out similar, so that we could you
5	know, you're not excluding certain things
6	because there's one bad apple in that
7	particular grouping.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea, and then
9	Julie.
10	MEMBER CAROE: I agree first that we
11	need to move this as a sunset item, and then
12	what I would suggest in moving forward, and
13	obviously
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Did you say move
15	or remove? I just wanted
16	MEMBER CAROE: Move forward with the
17	sunset process. But afterwards, and the next
18	step is going to be largely impacted by our
19	decisions on ag versus non-ag and synthetic
20	versus non-synthetic.
21	So I would hold off making any work

plan yet, and then also I would suggest that

we try to elicit some petition from the public, as far as you know, folks that are using these.

They can actually come up with these categories and petition those color categories, probably a lot better than anybody on this board, with the exception of Julie, who has some understanding in this area.

But you know, I would suggest that we entertain or put as a priority to entertain working on this, based on comments received.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie, and then Nancy.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes, I wanted to add to that, that I think that a petition — if someone would petition colors to be moved to 606, that process would serve exactly the function that you're asking for Nancy, in terms of parsing out what exactly are the colors that are manufactured and how are they manufactured, and which ones qualify as agricultural products and which ones do not

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

and why don't they. 1 2 We will -- I think we have access to much better information now than the board had 3 in 1997 or whenever that was. 4 5 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy. MEMBER OSTIGUY: I'm fine with that, 6 7 as long as there actually is no delay in us starting the process, and it may not be that 8 we hear it immediately, and it may be that, 9 you know, our first action is to ask the 10 11 community to start getting the petitions together. 12 But I don't want to delay it, since 13 it's already -- it's almost been ten years 14 that this process started, and it's been five 15 16 years that they've been used without a board 17 review. 18 So I don't want to delay. I realize we don't make a decision until we have some of 19 20 the other things in place.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

would be very easy to get the public to file a

CHAIRMAN O'RELL:

21

22

I think that it

petition to remove colors from 605(a) and put 1 2 it on 606, which is really this committee has talked about it, that that's probably the 3 place that they belong, 4 and that would 5 eliminate most of the issues we have today. But we do have to recognize the fact 6 7 that they're in use today. They're in a lot products, and the annotation 8 naturally-derived. 9 MEMBER OSTIGUY: It's duplicate. 10 11 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So we could have a plan to move forward to get resolution, and 12 13 recognizing the public comment that it wasn't initially recommended by the board. 14 But as Joe said, we've caught the original 15 We're here dealing with it now. 16 MEMBER GIACOMINI: Ouestion? 17 18 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes, Dan. MEMBER GIACOMINI: Just for 19 clarification, will we be voting on this, both 20 21 them together or individually flavors

versus colors?

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: We had grouped
2	the recommendations were grouped by the
3	categories in 205.605(a), 205.605(b) and then
4	606. So since both of these items appear
5	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Even though there
6	seems to be different issues, and to a certain
7	extent especially revolving around
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, when we have
9	discussion, we'll have discussion of those
10	items, and somebody could split it. Somebody
11	could have a motion to split.
12	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Could I have some
13	additional input then from those more in the
14	know, on the financial impact of removing
15	colors?
16	MEMBER SMILLIE: Well, I can't give
17	you any numbers, but a lot, a great deal, I
18	would say probably 50 percent of processed
19	foods would probably be utilizing these two
20	things. Kevin, what do you think?
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yeah, and
22	particularly in the dairy industry, there's

1	widespread use, a lot of manufacturers. We
2	had a public comment from Stony Field Farms,
3	indicating that they use a lot of those colors
4	in their yogurts. There's organic Colby
5	cheese on the market that uses anado.
6	MEMBER GIACOMINI: But This comes
7	down to a desire in the marketing to meet a
8	consumer perception of what a product should
9	look like, not the type of thing of there
10	won't be any more pears next year. I'm just
11	trying to understand.
12	I see in my mind a very big
13	difference between those two things, and I
14	don't see a huge I'm not sure that I
15	understand a huge impact of not putting a
16	color in a particular item.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Are you going to
18	respond to that question? Okay Bea, and then
19	I'll take it.
20	MEMBER JAMES: For all the things
21	that we do to make sure that we put forth a

meets consumer

product

that

22

expectation,

whether it's a pear and the things that we have done to try to protect the crops industry, so that they have good-looking pears on the market that will sell, as well as you know, milk that is -- meets the expectations of the consumer, I think that you could apply that same principle to how cherry yogurt should, you know, is expected to look in the case by the consumer.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Yeah, and furthermore I don't want to color this argument too deeply, but --

(Laughter.)

MEMBER SMILLIE: The current reality is that manufacturers do understand that there's a lot of pressure and commercial availability to move towards organic colors and flavors. That is happening. It's not as if, you know, that movement isn't taking place right now.

As a certification agent, we're continually challenging the manufacturer, if

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

you must use this material rather than a certified organic, give us your justification for it.

So I think we've received public testimony from both Smucker Quality Beverages and Stony Field on this issue, and both of them come back with the same thing, is that they support the continued use.

They do understand that they've got to move away from it, and they report in detail on how successful they have been in gradually shifting towards certified organic flavors and colors.

But at this point in time, it's still not -- for some flavors and some colors, they're still not available, those materials that they can use.

So therefore there is a big impact, but again, not to -- I mean we are being successful in moving away from the use of these and towards certified organic colors and flavors.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The direction is towards more organic flavors and organic certified colors. So it's because of their placement again on the list. If they're placed on 605(a), there isn't that carrot out there, for them to want to use organic colors.

If it's on 606, again, with our commercial availability and the criteria guidelines, that the certifiers will ask those questions of manufacturers, why aren't you using an organic color that's available.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: It just seems to me that this conversation would have been conducted with much more detail when the NOSB voted to have them removed from the list, and that I can understand someone voting to have them not be renewed, in support of what was probably then a more detailed discussion than we're having very briefly now. But that may be incorrect.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Kevin, I just want to -- what you just referred -- are you

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

referring to the reference that was made to an 1 2 earlier recommendation that they be removed from the list, like we're talking like several 3 years ago? Is that --4 5 MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes. that 6 MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. Αt 7 time, there were virtually no organic flavors. So I just, as a point that --8 MEMBER GIACOMINI: I'm referring to 9 colors in this one. 10 11 MEMBER WEISMAN: Or colors. There were no organic any of those being produced at 12 13 So I agree with your point, but that time. the discussion at that time, there were no 14 alternatives at that time. So it wouldn't 15 have been that no organic alternatives at that 16 time. 17 18 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea? MEMBER JAMES: Dan, I think -- I 19 20 mean I understand that it's important to have 21 natural colors, and that's, you know, as a lot

of people here have suggested, that's where

the industry is working towards.

But to not renew them means that a consumer that is accustomed to buying a product and having it look a certain way, and then all of the sudden opening that product and having it be brown, would be completely devastating to the industry.

We have to allow the manufacturers the time to be able to find a suitable natural replacement, so that they can keep their product consistent with what the consumer's been used to over the years.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Well, if we take it off the list, natural flavors, it would have to be organic for suitable replacement.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, we're talking about colors.

MEMBER JAMES: Yes, yes.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: Things take a lot of time to go through the process, and that's not saying anybody's slow or not acting, but they take a lot of time.

1	If the NOSB acted years ago to
2	request that they be removed, and it's obvious
3	in the subsequent time that you didn't want
4	they removed, why didn't the NOSB ever take
5	action to stop NOP from progressing on that,
6	if that action had been taken?
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Well actually, how
8	it sort of seems to have proceeded was that it
9	showed up in the National Register notice on
10	the list, and then you'd have to go through
11	the it's complicated. That's all I can say
12	at the moment. I'm not going to be able to
13	explain.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
15	MEMBER CAROE: Just, you know, this
16	Discussion, I think, is our next meeting
17	discussion when we look at the petitions for
18	these materials. Right now, this is sunset.
19	We've got a lot of things to go over today.
20	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yeah, we do. We do
21	have a lot more stuff to do.

MEMBER CAROE: You know, you want to

know economic impact. Anybody that's using colors right now just in packaging and shelf-slotting that they'll lose, it's huge. It's huge.

I mean if they have packaging that says they've got colors on it and you want to take colors away, they have to redo all of their packaging. That's a big expense, just for one manufacturer.

Fifty percent of the products on the market are using color. So you know, right now for sunset, I don't think we have any other choice but to renew it. Let's get the petitions, have this detailed discussion next meeting. My recommendation.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Is there any further discussion on these two items?

Otherwise, we'll go on. And again, we'll have time to hear public comment and input before we make our votes.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. In that case, I'd like to move on to Section 605(b),

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

which for this committee just involves chlorine materials and lecithin-bleached.

So this is for chlorine materials and for lecithin-bleached, to be used as allowed synthetics in non-agricultural substances, allowed as ingredients in or on processed products labeled as organic or made with organic.

The Federal Register notice regarding the sunset review asked the public to provide evidence and address concerns for substances they believe should be any discontinued. Of the many comments that -many comments were received recommending the continued allowance of chlorine materials in organic handling, and there were no comments specifically against the continuation chlorine materials on the national list for this purpose.

In addition, the NOSB had requested that a technical evaluation report be conducted reviewing chlorine use and organic

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

handling, and we received this technical report from the program, from the NOP on January 6 of 2006, and that report favorably answered the criteria questions for substances to be used in organic handling.

The technical review did not indicate that there was any new information about chlorine materials since its original petition, that would make it inconsistent with organic practices.

So based on public comments from sunset review an the technical report, the handling committee does recommend the continued use of chlorine materials in this category.

With regard to lecithin-bleached, many comments were received recommending the continued allowance of lecithin-bleached. There were also comments opposed to the continuation of the substance.

During the November NOSB meeting, a manufacturer of organic lecithin announced

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

that they could produce an organic bleached lecithin to meet the current organic market needs.

So as part of our due diligence, the Handling Committee contacted this manufacturer, while considering this recommendation, to verify the commercial availability as organic of this substance. The manufacturer did confirm its availability as organic.

So therefore, based on the public comment that there is an organic alternative available to replace a synthetic on the national list, the Handling Committee is recommending not to renew lecithin-bleached.

I would just like to point out that we did hear comment yesterday evening from Lynne Clarkson (ph), who is a manufacturer of lecithin, who agreed with this recommendation. therefore, the Handling Committee So of recommends the renewal the following substance in this use category as published in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the finial rule, Part 205.605(b), chlorine materials, disinfecting and sanitizing food contact surfaces, and then as-listed.

In addition, the Handling Committee recommends deferring a vote, not in this category. The Handling Committee recommends not renewing the following substances in this use category: lecithin-bleached.

This recommendation was moved by Kevin O'Rell, seconded by Andrea Caroe, and was voted unanimously to move forward.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And I just might add on the chlorine, the committee was aware of and discussed that there is a processing committee recommendation from April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2003 that went to the NOP for clarification of the annotations associated with chlorine.

We still feel that this is relevant, but it is separate from sunset, because we are not going to be changing annotations. But as part of our work plan, it is to go back and to address this processing committee

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

recommendation from 2003 back to the NOP, to
find out where, why it hasn't gone forward.

Because it does summarize the

back in, I think, 1995 for chlorine.

original intent in the initial recommendation

Discussion?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.

MEMBER WEISMAN: So we are moving on to Section 606, which is non-organically produced agricultural products allowed as ingredients in or on processed products labeled as organic or made with organic.

We are considering lecithin unbleached for renewal in this section. The committee summary is as follows:

Many comments were received reporting the retention of materials, including lecithin unbleached, currently listed in Section 205.606. One commenter who generally appeared to object to the entire national list opposed the relisting, along

with everything else of this material.

However, detailed information as to why lecithin-unbleached was not compatible with organic practices, as specified in the Federal Register, was not provided in that comment.

Another commenter noted that organic forms of lecithin are available and had concerns that there will be no market for the organically-produced material if the non-organically produced material remains on the list.

However, some commenters also noted that the organic form is either insufficient in quantity or inadequate in some functionality.

Comments were received from a manufacturer or organic lecithin-unbleached, who indicated that organic lecithin unbleached can be manufactured in sufficient quantity to meet demand.

However, this manufacturer also

clearly stated that organic forms of every formulation of lecithin-unbleached that are currently being used do not yet exist.

The Handling Committee agrees, based on compelling evidence given by a manufacturer of organic lecithin-unbleached, that every use of lecithin bleached can in fact not adequately be filled by the forms currently available.

Therefore, the Handling Committee recommends the renewal of lecithin-unbleached in this use category. There were, for deferral there were none in that category and for not renewing. There were none at this time in this category.

The recommendation was moved by Andrea Caroe, seconded by Kevin O'Rell, and the committee voted unanimously to move forward with this recommendation.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And again yesterday late, we heard from that manufacturer, who submitted public comments

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

supporting our recommendation and supporting, in effect, that we were removing the bleached lecithin from the list, but maintaining the lecithin-unbleached as an agricultural product Because recognizing there were not all sorts -

organic lecithins There were not available that would meet possibly applications. But in light -- that, conjunction with our commercial availability recommendation, that now puts criteria out there for the ACAs to ask questions of, we felt that would be enough to move along those people who don't want to use organic lecithin totally based on cost.

They would have to have a justification by the criteria we propose. So Andrea?

MEMBER CAROE: Just really quick.

Valerie, I think this is probably for you.

It's a small technical correction. The title

of this recommendation is a typo. It's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	205.606. There's no (b).
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: A new category.
3	MEMBER CAROE: So we just probably
4	should reflect, as posted right now on the
5	website, it says 606(b), and there's no such
6	animal.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes, okay. Thank
8	you, Andrea. Any discussion?
9	(Pause.)
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.
11	MEMBER WEISMAN: Right. There is
12	one other pretty brief item that is on the
13	Handling Committee's agenda for this meeting.
14	As Discussion item only, and that is
15	agricultural versus non the definition of
16	agricultural versus non-agricultural.
17	So I just want to make a brief
18	statement about that, which is really more of
19	an update. This is an item on the Handling
20	Committee's work plan, which has over the past
21	year also included participation from the
	year also included participation from the

Materials Chair, to take advantage of

additional technical expertise.

A comment was heard yesterday regarding a proposed request that yeast be considered as livestock.

So I just wanted to reiterate, in case it was not clear yesterday, that the committee is entertaining this approach, and to that extent, we have expanded the working group to formally include the full Materials Committee, not just the chair, although it will still be led by the Handling Committee.

If we do move forward with this idea of yeast as livestock, there are additional considerations which we may have to address, such as perhaps a rule change modifying the definition of agricultural product that would exclude only minerals, because at present it does exclude microbial organisms. We would have to look at that.

We would also have to ask, start asking the questions how, you know, I'm still -- I'm coming off of Passover, and part of the

ritual was how is this night different from all other nights. So the question here is how is this livestock different from all other livestock?

(Laughter.)

MEMBER OSTIGUY: We had original sin, and now we have --

MEMBER WEISMAN: Nancy says it has no legs. So we might -- in addition, we might need to look at things like deleting things like living conditions and access to pasture, as considerations. We would have to look at things like 100 percent organic feed.

Then alternately, to consider yeast as livestock, we are also -- might have to consider whether OFPA will allow a rule change to create some other category of non-plant life. That was also a possibility that was discussed.

So this will now be an item on the work plans of a Joint Materials and Handling Committee going forward.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the hope would
2	be to have that recommendation for the next
3	meeting.
4	MEMBER WEISMAN: I think
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That concludes the
6	Handling Committee's agenda.
7	MEMBER WEISMAN: The Handling
8	Committee's agenda item.
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Good job, Julie.
LO	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Julie.
L1	(Applause.)
L2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Synthetic, Non-
L3	synthetic. Nancy?
L4	Joint Materials and Handling Committee Report
L5	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Well, we'll deal
L6	with this all in one fell swoop and we'll see
L7	how long the discussion goes. I'm going to
L8	read what we put together.
L9	It's a Joint Materials and Handling
20	Committee response to the NOP documents, dated
21	March 9th, 2006, the evaluation of the NOSB
22	recommendations on the definition of synthetic

and recommended framework for further clarify the definition of synthetic.

The Handling Committee and Materials Committee have received the NOP documents dated March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006, "Evaluation of the NOSB Recommendation on the Definition of Synthetic, and Recommended Framework to Further Clarify the Definition of Synthetic," as well as the decision tree to distinguish synthetic and non-synthetic substances.

In general, we find great merit in the comments contained these documents. The documents reflect an attempt to preserve the sprit of our intent, and place them in a form that will pass regulatory muster.

We do not see revealed in them any major ideological differences, but rather constructive and useful criticism given in the spirit of collaboration. We agree with the observation that the recommendation, clarification of the definition of synthetic, adopted on August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2005, needs to be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

organized in a logical sequence with the explanation for its need clearly stated at the outset, and which terms are more clearly defined and separated from policy interpretations, and which makes more concise recommendations.

We are appreciative of the point-bypoint responses corresponding to the numbered
items in the NOPB recommendation, which
reflect a thorough and thoughtful analysis of
our original document.

In addition to the NOP's evaluation, we've received a number of public comments which reflect rigorous analysis of both our original recommendation and the NOP's evaluation of it.

These public comments will be taken into account as well. The press of equally urgent issues to be considered and acted upon in advance of this meeting did not allow us to draft a revised recommendation for the definition of synthetic, in time to be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

discussed here.

However, we have devised a detailed outline and proposed a time line for incorporating the suggestions contained in the NOP documents, into a revised recommendation, that could be discussed and perhaps even voted on at the next NOSB meeting.

In summary, the Joint Materials and Handling Committee find that the two NOP documents produced in response to the NOSB recommendation on the definition of synthetic on August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2005, contain valuable feedback which the Joint Committee will be able to use effectively to sharpen our recommendations concerning the definition of synthetic.

The NOP suggestions, along with the recently-received public comment, will be used to propose a revised recommendation on this subject, which will be posted well in advance of the fall meeting allowing for a 30-day public comment period, and perhaps a vote in the fall meeting.

We again thank everyone at the National Organic Program responsible for producing the thoughtful -- the thorough and thoughtful comments contained in these documents.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Nancy.

Any questions or discussion?

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Thank you, Nancy. Rigo is going to take the lead on our next item, which will be a recommendation. So we'll have a presentation and discussion on Commercial Availability, and then this afternoon we'll be taking a vote on that document. Rigo?

# Commercial Availability Committee Report

MEMBER DELGADO: Thank you, Kevin. First of all, I want and appreciate all the work that Julie put into this document and rest of the two committees. It was fantastic work and it was incredible to do over long distance. It's just a lot of things.

Essentially what we're recommending 1 2 is a document on establishment of commercial availability criteria. The goal was to come 3 up with some acceptable criteria, to determine 4 5 what's commercially available or not. Going straight the 6 to 7 recommendation, we have essentially two, three The first one involves the applicant, 8 and we're providing information on the -- that 9 should be included on the information to be 10 11 included in the petition that is posted on the web page of the NOP. 12 It essentially provides information 13 to the petitioner of what materials or what 14 information must be included in that petition. 15 Point B talks about how the NOSB is 16 going to review those materials, highlighting 17 18 the point that we will be reviewing and not so much evaluating the data. 19 20 In Point C, the third and last, it's mainly a list of items that should be followed 21

by the ACAs, and describes in detail the

different steps and points that ACAs should follow to evaluate, validate and come up with a decision.

The conclusion is the following: It is the opinion of the NOSB members that the three recommendations listed provide the acceptable criteria and procedures to determine commercial availability.

The recommendations provide for timing determinations regarding commercial availability. The recommendation from the committee was moved by Andrea Caroe, seconded by Mike Lacy. It was approved by 6 votes, only one absent person, and that is my conclusion of the summary.

We received a number of comments, most of them positive. We only received probably a couple negative, commenting on the fact that perhaps the detail on the -- the detail presented on Point B, referring to the work of the NOSB, is not as much as should be, and otherwise, very good reviews from most of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	the comments.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Rigo.
3	Discussion and questions? No, no. We're not
4	voting on it now.
5	MEMBER CAROE: I know. But I mean
6	is this going to be a vote item or a
7	discussion item?
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: This will be a
9	vote this afternoon.
10	MEMBER CAROE: Then I do want to
11	kind of fill in some more background then.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
13	MEMBER CAROE: This particular
14	recommendation went through quite a few
15	elaborate drafts. A lot of detail was put in
16	and then pulled out, and some of it put back
17	in. We really, really balanced with this for
18	quite a while.
19	The challenge for us with this was
20	to be efficient with the present petitioning
21	process, and allow for, you know, to try to

integrate into the processes that already

exist, and also maintain the flexibility of the certifier -- not the flexibility -- the ability for the certifier to do their job and act quickly on this particular requirement.

there was detail So taken I responded to Jim Riddle, Again, as commented this the other on day, our recommendation for the adjustment the petition process consistent with is that document.

I do respect the fact that Jim suggests that there should be more detail, and I feel that might be a follow-on item in the entire petition process, in looking at the detail that a petitioner needs to provide, not only for this type of petition but for petitions for other lists as well.

I consider that a separate item. At this point, we need to quickly act on commercial availability, so that we can move forward, especially based on the changes that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	will be made due to the lawsuit.
2	Also, we had a tremendous amount of
3	detail included as far as the work of the
4	board and the work of the certifier. A lot of
5	that detail was also removed.
6	However, I can say that in working
7	with the certifiers, the Certification,
8	Accreditation and Compliance Committee is
9	going to collaborate with the program, and be
10	able to provide that level or that standard of
11	performance at the certifier training.
12	Guidance doesn't mean as much as if
13	we can actually integrate into the training
14	sessions, and establish that standards of
15	performance, so that the enforcement of this
16	would be in the accreditation process.
17	So that's just a little bit of
18	background, and this was a very work-intensive
19	recommendation. That's really all.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Andrea.
21	Joe?
22	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes. I think

Andrea summed it up very accurately and succinctly. The key here is that the NOSB does have a responsibility to be part of the process, and what we've tried to do is keep our role as minimal as possible, and really put the role of the certification agent as primary in determining this.

But again, it's got to be a balance between the NOP, the NOSB and the certification agent. This is going to be an extremely, extremely important issue, and that we're really looking forward to a really specific training in this.

Because it's one of those areas out Ι think I find particularly there that contentious, and that's the inconsistency of of interpretation by ACAs commercial availability. So it's going to be a real focus of the program, and hopefully we'll aid that focus, to make sure that manufacturers and producers and everyone in the community is judged evenly far commercial as as

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

availability goes.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And I think this goes really a long ways in terms of putting out consistent criteria for the ACAs to apply evenly, so that everybody's asking the same questions, looking for the same bit of information.

The other Part B in terms of the board's role, and the board does have the responsibility from OFPA in recommending materials to the national list, for inclusion on the national list.

But that's a public process. So when materials come up, after the board reviews them, their agricultural components, they check the petitioner's petition for completeness and make sure that there is some credibility there for a case of commercial availability.

That recommendation would be put to the public, posted to the public for input. So if people out there in the public know of

1	this ingredient or material is available
2	organically, I mean that's the kind of
3	information, that's kind of the check that
4	we're looking for to bring that to the board,
5	before the board would vote on an item.
6	MEMBER MOYER: I have one question,
7	Kevin. In Section C, Item No. 3, where we're
8	asking I guess my question is are we asking
9	the ACAs to develop those lists and then
10	supply them to the applicant or the operator?
11	Is that any undue pressure on them?
12	Because the word just says "if they
13	have it." Does that mean we're inferring that
14	we're going to develop those lists, or if they
15	happen to have them they give them?
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
17	MEMBER SMILLIE: I'd like to ask the
18	NOP to comment first before I did, because it
19	is one of the intentions to create some fairly
20	quick database access for that, and I'm just
21	wondering where

MEMBER MOYER: In which case the

1	applicant would have direct access to that
2	data, but not through the ACA.
3	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes, because right
4	now, certification agents are well, it's a
5	complicated issue, because we're not allowed
6	to consult, in any way, shape or form or favor
7	one source over another.
8	So as certification is, we have to
9	be very removed from that process. At the
10	same time, we're judged with determining
11	whether that is available or not.
12	So sometimes we have confidential
13	business information that we know it's
14	available, but we're not allowed to see it.
15	So the ultimate answer, I think, on
16	this one is going to rest with the NOP
17	database.
18	MEMBER MOYER: This is inferring
19	that you're going to make that available.
20	MEMBER CAROE: Not particularly.
21	MEMBER SMILLIE: No, we really
22	can't.

1	MEMBER MOYER: I'm sorry. Maybe I
2	read it wrong.
3	MEMBER CAROE: Notify them of
4	sources of information.
5	MEMBER SMILLIE: Which list?
6	MEMBER MOYER: Which list?
7	MEMBER SMILLIE: And right now
8	MEMBER MOYER: The available list
9	the available ingredients, if the ACA happens
10	to have that list.
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: Correct, and well
12	speaking frankly
13	MEMBER MOYER: That seems like
14	strange language to me. That's all.
15	MEMBER SMILLIE: Well speaking
16	well, the only two sources that I and
17	again, I don't want to flavor the conversation
18	too much, but the only two sources I currently
19	think of is all of the web sites of the ACAs,
20	which list all of their clients and their
21	products, which is required in the regulation,

and the Organic Trade Association, the Yellow

Pages.

Now I'm sure there are many others out there, but right now, you know, it just depends on your own specific knowledge of those availabilities. Again, I don't want to answer. I want to hear on the NOP on what their answer is to this.

MR. BRADLEY: Mark Bradley, National Organic Program. We've been wrestling around with this as well, as far as how that information would be made available to certifiers.

A lot of people want to keep that confidential, as confidential business information. Sources of organic products, of course, is contentious at best at some point.

I don't know that we're going to be able to maintain that list at NOP just because of, you know, the work requirements. So that's something that's still up in the air. How's that, Joe?

MEMBER SMILLIE: I don't think I'm

really particularly fond of the answer, but let's get more money available for the National Organic Program, because it's really -- I really believe that they have to be repository of that kind of database.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Let Andrea go first.

MEMBER CAROE: Okay. I just want to give an example of the type of situation that we're talking about.

Ιf I'm а manufacturer of complicated product, and I want to use ingredient organic that's available not necessarily on the market; nobody's selling that particular ingredient as organic, I may contract somebody to make that ingredient for me, and pay for their certification. That's done all the time.

But I don't want anybody, any of my competitors to know that that company can make that organic ingredient. It's my niche. That is a situation where I don't want that company

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

identified with that organic product.

We get into, you know, business strategy as well. So you know, this whole issue becomes very complex. Using lists like the trade association lists or, you know, the certifier list, is a very safe way to make these available without pointing out that "Gee, I know that there is, you know, organic cherry flavor, you know. Here's the name of the guy that sells it." We can't --certifiers can't do that, so that's --

MEMBER MOYER: That's why I'm concerned about this language.

MEMBER CAROE: It's saying "the list," making the lists available if you know of them. Just that's all we can do.

MEMBER MOYER: I mean, it's saying that if somebody applies to use a product, and the certifier is saying that they know that something else is available, are they obligated to make that available?

If they know that you're doing it,

1	how do they get that information to somebody
2	else without
3	MEMBER CAROE: Because you refer
4	them to a list. That's what the language of
5	this, of number three. It says that "You
6	notify the certification applicant or operator
7	of the sources of information which list
8	available organic ingredients. You don't
9	notify them of the source of the organic
10	ingredient. You notify them of the source of
11	the list."
12	MEMBER MOYER: Of the list, if you
13	have it.
14	MEMBER CAROE: Right. It's too hard
15	to tie down and be any proscriptive than that.
16	And as Joe mentioned, we have talked to the
17	program for a long time about the prospect of
18	this massive database. At that time, it will
19	be, you know,
20	MEMBER MOYER: That would make it
21	easier.
22	MEMBER CAROE: It would make it

easy. It would make a lot of things that certifiers do easy, like their annual reporting. But it's not there yet.

You know, I just have just gone through doing a database for my company, and I can't imagine the challenges that they have with this sized database. But some day.

MEMBER MOYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?

MEMBER JAMES: Andrea, this is kind of a philosophical question. Does that seem somewhat unethical to you, that a manufacturer would try to be secretive and exclusive with their organic ingredient, and maybe potentially force another manufacturer to move to 70 percent or 95 percent because they can't find that ingredient?

MEMBER CAROE: I absolutely don't.

I think manufacturers have a lot of trade secrets. Their formulas are trade secrets.

They don't want anybody to know what those are. It's business. I know, it's not

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	unethical.
2	MEMBER JAMES: I just ask that at a
3	point in history when the organic industry is
4	trying to grow.
5	MEMBER CAROE: You know, it's not
6	that warm and fuzzy. This is about making
7	money.
8	MEMBER JAMES: That's just too bad.
9	MEMBER CAROE: Kevin.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie.
11	MEMBER WEISMAN: Also Bea, I just
12	wanted to clarify that not knowing that the
13	organic ingredient is available would not
14	necessarily move that product into a "made
15	with" category.
16	It means that the certifier would
17	agree that they've done their due diligence,
18	and that they will have an allowance to use
19	the non-organic agricultural product under
20	that situation.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
22	MEMBER DELGADO: Well, I just want

to emphasize the point that Andrea brought up, 1 that we do need to develop some 2 sort criterion, especially with regards to Point B. 3 I still think that we should have a 4 5 consistent approach evaluating to materials, not only from material to material, 6 7 but year to year, and that's probably one item that we should concentrate on. 8 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea? 9 CAROE: This is 10 MEMBER just 11 You know, look at our review process start. and our evaluation forms. We don't even have 12 evaluation forms for these materials yet. 13 That level of detail is coming. 14 I agree. 15 MEMBER DELGADO: I'm just 16 saying this is probably an action item for us, for the work plan. 17 18 MEMBER CAROE: Absolutely. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. 19 Thank you, 20 I guess we were schedule to go from 21 11:00 to 1:00, and it's 12:20, with public 22 So we need to start public comment. comment.

1	What I'd like to request is that we
2	take absolute no more than a ten minute break,
3	just to get set up for public comment. we'll
4	get the list and do we have the list here,
5	or is it still
6	MS. FRANCES: It's out there on the
7	
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay, because
9	otherwise I would announce the first two
10	speakers. I don't even know who that is.
11	MS. FRANCES: Kastel. Mark Kastel.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Mark Kastel will
13	be the first speaker when we come back at
14	12:30 sharp. Thank you.
15	(Whereupon, a short recess was
16	taken.)
17	Public Comment
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: We're going to
19	start the public comment session. We have a
20	lot of people signed up. This isn't a
21	requirement, but this is a plea from the
22	board, that if you can, keep your comments

short. \

If you can keep them to three minutes or less, it's really going to help us get through this, because we have work to do, and we have some people that are going to be leaving here at the end of the day because we scheduled an adjournment.

If we don't get to vote on these action items, this is not going to be good for the public. So I know it's not a requirement.

We can't cut public comment speaking time, but I implore you to please help us out, because we've got to get to our work.

We want to hear from the public. Particularly we want to hear about the issues that we've been debating this morning. That would be the most helpful for us.

Let me read the NOSB policy for public comments at NOSB meetings. All persons wishing to comment at NOSB meetings during public comment periods must sign up in advance.

Persons will be called upon to speak 1 2 in the order they sign up. Unless otherwise indicated by the chair, each person will be 3 given five minutes to speak. 4 5 Persons must give their names affiliations for the record. 6 A person may 7 submit a written proxy for -- to the NOP or NOSB requesting that another person speak on 8 his or her behalf. 9 No person will be allowed to speak 10 11 during the public comment period for more than ten minutes. We really hope we don't have a 12 13 lot of ten minutes. But if you have a proxy, 14 let us know. Individuals providing public comment 15 will refrain from any personal attacks 16 17 that otherwise from remarks impuqn the character of an individual. 18 Thank you. first speaker is Mark Kastel. 19 On deck, George Siemon. Third, Albert Straus. 20 21 MR. KASTEL: Good afternoon. Is

Yes.

I'm Mark Kastel.

this working?

22

I'm

1	here again representing the Cornucopia
2	Institute based on Cornucopia, Wisconsin. I
3	do have a proxy. We probably won't need that.
4	I'm going to really respect, Mr.
5	Chairman, your comments and requests, but I
6	have to say that this may be the last
7	opportunity we have to talk about origin of
8	livestock before court-mandated adjustments
9	are made. So particularly
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I understand.
11	We're not trying to
12	MR. KASTEL: Right. But we also
13	respect your needs. So I want to tell you,
14	and we'll have a couple of brief comments on
15	materials.
16	A tale of two farms, to illustrate
17	where we're at here. I interviewed a farmer
18	in New York, who's milking about 100 cows on
19	pasture. He manages his calves from birth
20	organically.
21	He feeds his bottle calves 100
22	percent organic milk, the same quality of milk

that he and his family market and that is available on the store shelves.

He estimated his investment in the milk alone at 15 to 17 thousand dollars per year to raise 40 calves. He raises all his animals when they're weaned on organic pasture, hay, grain. He buys some of his feed, and we know what organic commodities are selling for today.

The story on the second farm, which I visited last fall. I'm sorry. Strike that from the record. This was not a farm I visited last fall.

Second farm. I visited with the officers of this corporation twice in the last couple of months. A minimal amount of their cows are on pasture. They sell 100 percent of their calves at birth. They buy 100 percent of their replacement heifers at 700 pounds or approximately one year of age.

These heifers were most likely raised with conventional milk replacer. We

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

were discussing the intricacies of organically approved milk replacer. But this milk replacer likely contained dried blood, a BSE risk, and was likely produced from milk that had supplemental bovine somatotropin.

The feed crops or excuse me, also cattle might well have these very been administered antibiotics, prohibited and parasiticides, and other prohibited pharmaceuticals.

The feed grain is most likely coming from genetically engineered crops. They are fed feed that was raised with toxic pesticides, herbicides and fungicides, and again most likely in feed lot conditions.

That particular farm, Farm No. 2, did not have an expense for lost milk. Instead, they marketed probably 600 to 800 thousand dollars per year of extra milk that that first farmer didn't have the same market avenues for.

Both of these farms label their

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

products as organic in the marketplace.

Very quickly, two other examples.

One I'll call a shell game. Farmer A -- I've heard this story more than once from Western farms, on Western farms.

Farmer A, organic certified dairy producer. Sells all his calves off or transfers them in some form to Farmer B, who's a conventional heifer ranch. They're raised using all those conventional management tools that we discussed.

At one year of age, that animal is transferred to Farmer C, who's a conventional heifer operation. Now they're under -- now they're transitioned under organic management for one year of time.

At the end of that time, they are distributed back organic farms, and there is a strict prohibition in the current regulations about rotating animals in and out of organic management. They're breaking the current law on some of these farms.

Last example. There are some farmers who've decided and some certifiers that it's okay to use antibiotics on young stock on certified organic farms. So during the first period of life for these animals, they could receive a myriad of different prohibited materials, and then as long as --

In their interpretation, as long as they're managed organically for the last year before they go into organic production, it's okay. It might be a split operation that has organic and conventional cattle, so they might just transfer them around on the farm.

But again, is this rotating in and out of organic management, is it breaking the current law? We need very much of a tightening of the current regulations that are being abused, and this is a great opportunity with the court ruling to address this.

Very quickly, on two of the materials you discussed, and this is for information. We're not taking a position at

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the Cornucopia Institute, but let me tell you.

We've heard a lot of discussion from our

producers that are concerned that they won't

be able to whitewash their barns.

So if that is off the table, we don't have to be concerned about it. But the minute amount of incidental contact that might occur, they're not whitewashing the feed troughs, and it just, you know, I need you to balance that, and if it needs to be qualified so that that's an exempt operation using that material.

We're not, I don't think, reviewing other materials that are used to paint the barn or the milkhouse. There are other FDA and state regulations, and we should leave that open.

And oxytocin, again for information.

That was one of the questions we asked when we interviewed the 68 different private label and name brand marketing entities that were a part of our maintaining the organic integrity

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

of milk study.

We found a very high percentage, if not a majority -- I have not done the analysis -- of people who say we don't use any of it. I think one of the real reasons behind that was that it's very consuming to the consumer, that these marketing entities want to say no antibiotics, no hormones. Not a little asterisk saying "Well, no hormones, well but maybe for therapeutic purposes."

Consumers can't kind of cope with that. One safeguard obviously would be to have a vet like Hugh say that it's only applicable treatment if it's coordinated through a veterinarian.

So I'm going to close by just saying a big thank you for your patience yesterday, and your courtesy. This board really showed respect for the farmers that showed up here from around the country, and I know they greatly appreciated that, and they left with a very positive feeling.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Thank you. Mark, I just want to thank you for keeping grazing front and center in the organic community over the last couple of years. As far as oxytocin goes, I think -- I don't know what the annotation is right now, but it is -- the intent is only for an emergency purpose, hopefully veterinary administered.

Maybe we can do that annotation, you know, after the sunset process, and just for the record with the whitewash, you were referring to hydrated lime and you did not mention it.

MR. KASTEL: I'm sorry. Thank you, and you probably are well aware that on conventional farms, there is a potential for abuse of oxytocin as a production tool, and that's what we're concerned with.

It's just like having antibiotics in the milk house. If they're there, how do we really know how well they're controlled. That's why I would trust you, as being a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

practitioner, rather than just having it available free for all. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Mark.

George, and Albert Straus on deck. Tony Moore

MR. SIEMON: Hello, I'm glad to be here. George Siemon for the record. I kind of just felt like addressing you all because I missed orientation a little bit.

I really appreciate the experience to be in the NOSB, from all the parties involved, and it's a great sense of a growth that we're all part of. I think it's admiring the dedication. But I think it's also very important to remember how unique the NOSB is in the national government.

It's the only thing like it, and I think it's so important that we keep this up like we are, and I appreciate all of you all doing it. I also am so glad to see Valerie on board, and I've constantly given the advice of how important staff support is, to marry the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

following that.

work plans of the NOP and NOSB.

So I think one thing that NOSB needs to ask for is how can we dovetail with your work plans, when we're working on things that are common plain, instead of this just differences.

I think everybody's working together real well and I appreciate that.

My biggest concern about the whole process is -- one of my biggest concerns is the loss of the farm plan in the certification process. It used to be our foundation, and now I'm finding it to be almost irrelevant in the certification process.

So one of my challenges is how do we get back to using the farm plan, and that's a very difficult one, because the farm plan -- we're kind of moving to an absolutism, where the standard's this. There's no grey areas because we're afraid the certifiers aren't going to implement it equally.

So there's this move away from the

farm plan that really concerns me. If we heard the comments yesterday about intent, intent, intent, that's about the farm plan, and how do you do that unless you have some leveraging.

So I'm really interested in how we take the guidance documents and develop This kind of intent, and then how do we get the certifiers to be out there by applying the pressure. I heard the word "continued improvement." I really think that was a foundation of organics.

This move to only absolute standards, the way I understand, it really is covering up for a lack of evenhandedness amongst the certifiers. I think that's a real issue that Accreditation has to deal with.

You know, I think we need to have a way that the certifiers know that there's all this variation out there. I think we need to have a way where they can report that to the NOP and there's some response.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Ι know this brings up the review question, because that was the whole I found a committee working the other idea. applying the peer review day, model to certifying organizations that will ensure a high degree of integrity and consistency amongst the certifying agents.

This is a big, big deal now, is how do we get it more even out there, and how do we get you all's guidance into the farm plan.

I think it's a major issue.

Another thing that I've really got to remind you all is that I hear a lot about science and organics, and if we were only about science, we wouldn't be able to prohibit any of the materials we've already prohibited.

They're already scientifically proven safe.

So we've got to watch out for this "science" word. This is about organic principles, and whether they're consumers or farmers, it's all the same about organic principles.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So science is a bit of a trap for us, because we're already defying the bulk of the scientific community with their risk assessment that this is safe. We're now saying "No, we're not going to allow it, you know, and whether it's safe or principles it doesn't matter." Science is touchy stuff.

For those of you all who are new on the board, I just want to remind you that out here in this crowd is an incredible support staff out here, people that are just unbelievably experienced that have sat at these meetings for 15, 10 years now, 13 years, and who have a lot of experience.

I'd go back to what was said earlier about the sunset thing. I think it's really important that you all, at least the chairpeople, have either the e-mail network of previous chairpeople and reach out and ask "What's the history here?"

I think there's a lot of history being lost here, and I wouldn't agree with

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Andrea that we should not challenge the previous work. There was some shoddy work done in the early days, and I was part of it, and it was not good work.

We have to -- I know the sunset has its own process, but we have to challenge things. There's a lot that has changed in this industry from `95 to now that's phenomenal in the knowledge base.

Specifically, oxytocin. I really am surprised at your recommendation. Oxytocin may technically not be a hormone, but it's active like a hormone, it's understood as a hormone. We've prohibited in our crops since it was allowed by the USDA; we've never allowed it.

I think it's really dangerous to make decisions on the rare animal that's going to need that. You know, things don't go perfect on organic farms. That's what we have conventional markets for.

You know, we don't allow sprays on a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	crop when the crop's challenged. You know, we
2	have to keep the marketing label. Allowing
3	oxytocin for that rare use to me is not the
4	right move. It's the wrong direction, with
5	the kind of scrutiny we have now.
6	We've not allowed it for 11 years, and we've
7	not had any, that I'm aware of, any real
8	issues there.
9	So to me, livestock's different than
10	crops. You have the opportunity to treat
11	them. We have the standard and the rule that
12	says you must treat, and then we have the
13	conventional market. So thank you very much.
14	(Applause.)
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, George.
16	Albert. Tony Moore is on deck.
17	MR. STRAUS: Yeah, hi. I'm Albert
18	Straus from Straus Family Creamery, Marshall,
19	California. I have a few of the sunset
20	materials I want to talk about, and other
21	things.
21	things.

I'm kind of shocked that after all

this time, that we still have chlorine on the list. I've never used chlorine as a sanitizer in either a creamery or a dairy. I think it's a carcinogen. It doesn't have a place in organic, and I never thought it did.

Hydrated lime, I think that we use it for -- on bedding for preventing mastitis, as well as foot baths, instead of copper sulfate, because copper -- we don't want to the copper on our land.

So I would encourage that it stay on the list for now. I don't know if lime by itself or oyster shells isn't as effective, because it doesn't have the pH level.

it's a hormone. Oxytocin, It's being abused. It's being abused in conventional dairies, and in split operations, I have high concerns that it's being abused, and I don't think it's being tracked.

I don't think that certifiers are finding out, getting receipts of medications

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of dual operations, as well as organic operations are using, and preventing illegitimate use of it.

You know, I haven't had a prolapsed cow in probably a decade or more. So, you know, I'm not -- I know you like the tools but you know, we do with a lot less tools these days.

Milk replacer, I have no problem getting rid of that. I think I haven't used milk replacer in quite a few years. You know, emergency for milk replacers like, you know, if you have to wait a couple of hour to feed a calf or you know, find a cow to put it on, I just -- I don't know.

It's just, you know, go out and hand milk a cow if you need to. But I don't see the use for a milk replacer in an organic system.

Ivermectin, I don't feel that that should be on the list for milking cows or cows -- anything above, over a year old. I know

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that most of the problems are with the younger heifers. They'd have to document the cases.

Let's see. That kind of ties into my comments about replacement animals. What I would encourage to get to one system really, and I didn't think I talked that long --

One system is to have organic from birth, and then have allowances, under veterinary supervision or prescription, to be able to treat calves with dewormer or an antibiotic, within the first year of life, and then have that year before production. Then conventional replacements limited to five or ten percent of a herd on an ongoing basis.

The only other thing I have is that I have a pet peeve about treated sewage on organic crops, tertiary treated and secondary treated crops. I mean secondary treatment on organic crops, I think, is ludicrous, and I put it in a petition a couple of years ago, but nothing ever happened, or complained, excuse me. I guess I'll give up the minute.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. A
2	question.
3	MEMBER WEISMAN: When you say
4	"treated sewage," is that something different
5	than sewage sludge, which is absolutely not
6	allowed?
7	MR. STRAUS: In my looking up what
8	sewage sludge is, it says any form of sewage,
9	liquid, solids, and treated sewage, in my
10	mind, whether it's test secondary or tertiary,
11	is sewage sludge.
12	MEMBER WEISMAN: So it shouldn't be
13	allowed. What's the
14	MR. STRAUS: Should be allowed?
15	MEMBER WEISMAN: Should not, should
16	not.
17	MR. STRAUS: It's being used
18	readily.
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: It's prohibited.
20	It's one of the big three that's prohibited.
21	MR. STRAUS: Well, tell the
22	certifiers. Tell

1	MEMBER GIACOMINI: In my experience
2	with most certifiers, they're interpreting
3	sewage sludge as solids, and in the areas when
4	there's secondary and tertiary sewer water,
5	they're allowing that on crops.
6	MEMBER WEISMAN: So they're using
7	the effluent?
8	MEMBER KARREMAN: That's not
9	MEMBER GIACOMINI: We think that a
10	lot of people have thought so, but that seems
11	to be where and it's coming from somewhere.
12	I mean, I don't know that they've thought
13	about it themselves.
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: I mean to make a
15	point, it's not even allowed for the use on
16	conventional product within the 30 percent of
17	a "made with" product.
18	MR. STRAUS: Well, it's being used.
19	MEMBER WEISMAN: Are we talking
20	about effluent, the water effluent? What
21	portion of the water are we talking about?
22	MR. STRAUS: When you treat sewage,

1	you treat it in different
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: I'm quite familiar
3	with it.
4	MR. STRAUS: And they're using it
5	actually in Central Valley, California, cities
6	are putting that into irrigation systems, and
7	so that it gets irrigated onto organic as well
8	as conventional crops.
9	MEMBER WEISMAN: Now I'm trying to
10	understand. Are they putting out the water
11	effluent, or are they putting out water that
12	still contains sewage?
13	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Water effluent.
14	MR. STRAUS: It's the effluent that
15	
16	MEMBER WEISMAN: Out of the
17	treatment plants.
18	MR. STRAUS: They separate the
19	solids, they aerate it and then they spray it
20	on the fields.
21	MEMBER WEISMAN: I can't see how
22	they are doing it.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: And you're saying, Albert, that certifiers are aware of this and are allowing it?

MR. STRAUS: Definitely.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Is that the only question?

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Can I make a comment on that? What we're dealing with, and it is going to happen more in the West than it would in the East, and it's something that is absolutely true of Europe, it depends on what you want to define as effluent, and at what point it stops being effluent.

Because what we currently do is treat minimum secondary in the United we States, very few tertiary facilities, and that effluent, the water. So after we have gone filters through the trickling water or whatever it is to remove up to 95 percent of the biologically active materials, which is not necessarily stuff you see floating. That's always gone.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	But there's still biological
2	materials left in there. That leftover water
3	portion is dumped into your rivers. Depending
4	on how close you are from where that is
5	released into a river, you could be drinking
6	effluent.
7	MR. STRAUS: There are concerns
8	about heavy metals, viruses
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I know what the
10	concerns are. But it depends you know,
11	where are we going to draw the line then,
12	Because if I as a sewage treatment facility
13	dump that water into the river, and there's a
14	farmer a quarter mile downstream, that's
15	effluent also.
16	If you're in Europe, there is not a
17	stream that isn't primarily effluent, somebody
18	else's sewage treatment water that has been
19	put into the stream.
20	There are too many people. There
21	are very few rivers in the United States in

that shape, but the ones in the West are going

1	to have higher concentrations. There's one
2	river near Las Vegas that is primarily
3	effluent.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
5	MEMBER ENGELBERT: That's not in our
6	jurisdiction. That's out of our scope.
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Well, I understand
8	that. But if we're going to start talking
9	about effluent, the water being an issue, we
10	need to then decide when is it sewage and when
11	is it not in our minds.
12	MEMBER CAROE: Right. That's what
13	she's getting at.
14	MEMBER OSTIGUY: It's a gray area.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I'll take one more
16	comment on this, and then we're going to move
17	on. Bea?
18	MEMBER JAMES: I would like to ask
19	the NOP to address their opinion on that
20	situation.
21	MR. BRADLEY: We'll take a look at
22	this. This is Mark Bradley from the National

1	Organic Program. This situation's new to us,
2	and we need to look at it, but we will.
3	Albert, if you could file a complaint. I mean
4	I'm not
5	MR. STRAUS: I did a couple of years
6	ago.
7	MR. BRADLEY: Okay. I know.
8	MR. STRAUS: I'll follow up with
9	that.
LO	MR. BRADLEY: We'll check into this.
L1	MR. STRAUS: Okay, thank you.
L2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Before we
L3	get to our next speaker, I've just been asked
L4	to make an announcement, that the restaurant
L5	here, if somebody's planning to eat, closes at
L6	2:00. So just so you know that.
L7	Tony, Bill Clymer is next.
L8	MR. MOORE: Well, given the food,
L9	I'll make it really short. My name is Tony
20	Moore. I work for a company called Moore
21	Ingredients. I'm a certified flavor chemist.

We manufacture and create certified organic

flavors and certified organic ingredients, using them as flavors.

Thanks to all the board members today. It's been really informative to me, watching this whole stuff take place. It leaves me with a lot of concerns and confused me a little bit as well.

But the only thing I'd really like to ask is that the topic of organic flavors be explored more deeply, and be debated a little more before any decision is made.

As probably everyone here is aware, organic flavors and flavors in general are very complex mixtures. Very rarely do they constitute, you know, 100 percent ag except for botanical isolates.

But flavors are generally mixtures of ag and non-ag. They'll contain organic solvents, organic fruit juices, organic concentrates, acidulents (ph), and as well some non-ag products.

Also, just be aware of decisions

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

continue the made creation, the to continuation of markets of organic products. You know, in 1980, there natural was no aromatics market. Consumers wanted natural products, and the flavor industry rose that, and by 1990, natural flavors were our fastest-growing category in the flavor industry.

Also in 1990, it was thought that we couldn't create complex organic flavors. Here we are, 15, 16 years later and there's more than several companies offering, creating and selling organic products.

So please be aware of the decisions you made and how they can create new markets in the organic ingredients industry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Tony.

Did you have -- actually I did have a question, Tony. Sorry. The points you're making, could you give me some kind of quantifying on the ag/non-ag part?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Because one of the things we're talking about is moving flavors to ag, to 606.

MR. MOORE: Sure. How about I give a very brief description of a formula, a good organic flavor formula. Let's pick -- pick your berry. Usually can constitute a solvent, usually 30 to 40 percent, which is going to be alcohol, which is I would consider that agriculture.

You're usually going to have something of a named source. If it's a berry, you're going to have blueberry juice concentrate, ag source, correct? We may or may have an acidulent, which could be citric acid, which there is debatable. Right now it's non-organic.

The biggest problem we have in creating organic flavors in natural aromatics. I've kind of put a little outline of some aromatics on my comments. But there are some aromatics, and I'm using -- that's a kind word essentially for natural aroma chemicals.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Some things can be completely
2	derived physically from name products. Like
3	in my description I had talked about anathol
4	(ph) being derived from anasoil (ph). You
5	could also see citrol from lemon oil. The
6	list goes on and on.
7	But there are also products that are
8	made from completely natural sources,
9	completely natural products that will not be
10	considered ag because they've either been
11	manipulated by simple list aerification (ph),
12	that don't exist in that, you know, state in
13	the natural product.
14	That's our big problem in flavors.
15	So you essentially, just like maybe, you know,
16	commercial organic food and beverage products,
17	we have a complex mixture. It's not one
18	singular product you can make one decision on.
19	Does that answer your question? Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bill Clymer and
21	Kim Dietz on deck.

MR. CLYMER: My name is Bill Clymer.

I'm the parasitologist for Fort Dodge Animal Health. I call Amarillo, Texas home.

I'm going to start out by saying that I'm here representing Fort Dodge, but I'm also here representing a number of organic livestock producers, that asked me to get involved a little bit in this fray as far as antibiotic definitions are concerned.

Internal parasites can and do reach clinical levels in our livestock. Parasites can result in reduced production and even death. Organic producers need product or products that can be used to eliminate clinical parasite problems.

When I say the word "clinical," I'm talking about those that are at risk, and still be kind to a non-target organism such as the dung beetle.

I will refer to Moxidectin during my discussion, but my comments will apply to the rest of the microcylic lactones and a general term, and be Ivermectin, Vectomax (ph),

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Eprinex, as well as Cydectin.
2	The medically and regulatory
3	accepted okay. The medically and
4	regulatory accepted definition of an
5	antibiotic is an agent with anamicrobial or
6	anabacterial activity.
7	Moxidectin is an antiparasitic,
8	which includes the helmuts (ph) and insects,
9	but not anamicrobial activity and therefore is
10	not an antibiotic.
11	The structure of a compound is not a
12	predictor of its activity. An example
13	provided is erythromycin, a macrolide
14	antibiotic is anabacterial, not antihelumetic
15	(ph) or antiparasitic, if you prefer to use
16	that term.
17	It also works via an entirely
18	different mechanism of action. Therefore,
19	classifying molecules in a class via common
20	structure is inappropriate and misleading.
21	The next comment is taken from the

Drug Dictionary:

22

book Food

and

Official

Regulatory Terms, Government Institute's Research Group. C. Adams was the editor.

From the preface of this book and I read "It is important to keep in mind that this dictionary is not just a collection of absolute definitions, but is also a resource to identify basic regulatory concepts.

"There may be other means for many of the terms, but the definitions included in this dictionary reflect use of the term in a specific regulatory or statutory context.

"Each term carries a citation to place the term in that context for the reader."

Antibiotic drug. Any drug composed wholly or partly of any kind of penicillin, streptomycin, chlorotetracycline, chloroanphenotrol or bacitracin (ph), or any other drug intended for human use containing any quantity of any chemical substance which is produced by a microorganism and which has the capacity to inhibit or destroy

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

microorganisms in dilute solution 1 any 2 derivative thereof. The actual quotation is listed at 3 the bottom of that slide. 4 5 Moxidectin or f-Alpha, as it was first known when it first started being tested 6 7 for anabacterial activity, was found to have none of these activities. Antibiotic clearly 8 to anamicrobial or 9 refers anabacterial 10 activity, and is separate from antiparasitic. 11 Antihelumetics, an agent that is This is all still destructive to worms. 12 quotes from this book that I cited earlier. 13 Another book, Pharmacological Basis 14 of Therapeutics, 8th edition, is taken from 15 16 Section 11, "Chemotherapy of Microbial Diseases"; Chapter 44, "Anamicrobial Agents," 17 18 and this is considered the bible for pharmacologists all over the world. 19 Gilman 20 Dr. Goodman and were the 21 editors. Dr. Gilman won the Nobel Prize for

Medicine in the mid-90's, so these guys are

not amateurs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

"Antibiotics are chemical substances produced by various species of microorganisms, i.e., bacteria, fungi, acetomycetes (ph), that suppress the growth of other microorganisms and may eventually destroy them.

"When antibiotics are used," and this is still quoting, "When antibiotics are infection, used to treat an a favorable therapeutic outcome is influenced by numerous factors. However, in simple terms, success is dependent on achieving a level of anabacterial activity as the site of infection that sufficient to inhibit the bacteria that tips the balance in favor of the host."

erythromycin, Looking at what Ι would consider a true antibiotic, looking at the mechanism of action, erythromycin other macrolide antibiotics inhibit protein synthesis by binding reversibly 50-S subunits ribosomal of sensitive microorganisms.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Erythromycin and Moxidectin are in
2	the same structural class. However,
3	erythromycin is an antibiotic; Moxidectin is
4	an antiparasitic. They have different
5	mechanisms of action and target. The
6	structural properties of any compound are not
7	predictive of activity or mode of action.
8	"Moxidectin was tested for
9	anabacterial activity and was found to have
10	none." Thank you.
11	MEMBER JAMES: I have a question for
12	you.
13	MR. CLYMER: Yes ma'am.
14	MEMBER JAMES: Do you have a
15	conclusion to your presentation? A very,
16	short quick-like in summary what you really
17	MR. CLYMER: In summary, what I'm
18	saying is that the microcylic lactones, this
19	would be Ivermec, Vectomax, Eprinomectin (ph),
20	Cydectin and then some other generic look-
21	alike type products, are not classified to

those of us in the medical profession and in

1	the livestock profession as antibiotics.
2	They are classified as
3	antiparasitics. The antihelumetics refer to
4	just the worms, but when we say
5	"antiparasitics" we're talking about internal
6	and external.
7	All four of these products, the
8	microcylic lactones, are called endectocides.
9	That means I actually have activity, I guess,
10	against both internal parasites, such as the
11	worms, and some external parasites such as
12	lice, mites and that sort of thing.
13	So in summation, I would say that
14	antibiotics and antiparasitics, even though
15	they may be all in the macrolide group, they
16	actually have different activity, different
17	mode of action, different targets and
18	therefore I do not think they should be
19	classified as an antibiotic.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: Thank you for
22	clarifying this for us. We'll take it

definitely into our consideration. 1 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes ma'am. 2 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Would you say that 3 the similarity in structure is used initially 4 to try and select for which chemicals to 5 evaluate for similar activity, but from there, 6 7 they may or may not, as you're explaining, it's not active. So then the structure no 8 9 longer --I'd say that's a very 10 CLYMER: 11 good assumption, Because most of the companies involved in development, and I spent 23 years 12 private consultant 13 and а contract researcher and then was on the Texas A&M staff 14 prior to that. 15 16 So I haven't spent but a very small my adult life working for 17 portion of

specifically. They have a screening program,

and they're looking -
When they go through a screen, they

look at bacterial, fungi, insects, helmuts,

working

or

for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

industry,

18

19

20

21

22

industry

all these different things. So any compound that they find, if it has activity, say, against a disease, then it goes in the vet development program.

So they do start out looking for similar structures. I was fortunate enough to be the first one to inject Ivermec in a cow in 1976 as a researcher.

That product was actually found on a golf course in Japan, and I think maybe some executives were out trying to justify playing golf. But anyhow, but that's where that molecule actually came from. Any other comments? I appreciate very much your time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. Kim Dietz, followed by David Hiltz.

MS. DIETZ: Kim Dietz, past NOSB member. I'm going to comment on commercial availability, kind of rubber meets the road with this. I agree that the document is a great document. I'm concerned with a couple

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

of things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

One, again from a historical standpoint, the NOSB has made a recommendation on commercial availability, and in this document, it says that there's no standardized criteria to the ACAs.

Т the board know has а recommendation there, and out that certifiers, I hope most of them, that recommendation. I know that certifiers are requiring us to follow those guidelines, and we submit our background on why some things aren't commercially available.

So I'd encourage you to go back and look at that. I think Jim Riddle gave Rigoberto a copy of that yesterday.

The rubber meets the road. I'm concerned that this document is vague and that you're going to have a lot of materials coming in to be petitioned under 606.

I'm on the OTA task force for 606, and I know that we've been kind of waiting for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

this document to come out, so we know exactly what we need to petition and how, so that the petitions don't get rejected. So you should start seeing a number of petitions coming your way.

I'm primarily concerned with under Recommendation No. 2, it the says petitioning for inclusion on the national list non-organically produced of agricultural products, the petition must state why product should be permitted, and the production or handling of the organic product.

"Specifically, the petition must include current industry information." What is current industry information? The past board recommendation said that you must show three sources that you've tried to seek out that organic alternative, and you must have that documented.

So that past historical perspective should be in there somewhere, that a minimum of three vendors should be provided. You guys

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

should ask for that, because it's currently hopefully being used. So that's the one area.

The other one is under (c)(2). "The certifier must validate" or "shall," it says "shall validate that the applicant or operator has documentation proving that the ingredient is not commercially available in an organic form."

Again, what is that documentation? How much of it do you like? Is one person going to submit one letter from a supplier saying they don't have it, and some others submit ten? You need to be, I think, a little more specific with that. The minimum of three has been the industry standard.

Then also in order for an accredited certifying agent to allow this, it says that the organic form may be allowed once they've reviewed "a credible, available information listing, known sources of organic ingredients."

That doesn't exist, and is that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

going to bog down materials being allowed under 606. So that's my -- I'll just conclude with that. But I think that -- I know we need it. But again, I'm concerned that there's not going to be consistency out there.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?

MEMBER CAROE: I just want to reiterate that what we did with this document is this document is related to including materials on 606 open to commercial availability.

Those previous recommendations and how the certifier determines commercial availability comes as a second process. They're still intact, but they can't even do that process unless the material's on 606.

MS. DIETZ: Right, Right.

MEMBER CAROE: So this, you know, I feel that level of detail needs to remain, but it's a separate process than what we're discussing.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. DIETZ: Okay. I just you
2	know, from a certifier's standpoint, and
3	that's your expertise there. But is a
4	certifier going to say "Well, I don't have
5	this database, so therefore I don't know if
6	it's available in other places."
7	So there's just it seems a little
8	vague to me, and there's no list out there.
9	So you may it says they shall do it, and
10	that's shall use "they must." So you may want
11	to give them some options in this document.
12	MEMBER CAROE: And they can. There
13	is a list on OTA's website open to anybody
14	right now. So there's no reason why they
15	can't.
16	MS. DIETZ: All right. As long as
17	it's there. I heard earlier that there was no
18	list, and I know it's not you know, you're
19	using one source, a trade association, and
20	that's only going to list people's ingredients
21	that they ask to be put on that.

SMILLIE:

MEMBER

22

the

Well, by

1	regulation also there is a list of products on
2	each of the accredited certifiers'
3	association lists or websites.
4	MS. DIETZ: Okay. That's not as
5	much a concern as making sure that the handler
6	validates the minimum of three suppliers, and
7	right now you don't have any numbers in there.
8	That was more of my concern than the list.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: David Hiltz, and
10	do you have a proxy?
11	MR. HILTZ: Natalia Milo (ph) was
12	signed up behind me, and actually she's agreed
13	to allow me to use her time if necessary. So
14	I don't think I'll need that. I'm going to
15	cut my comments down in lieu of your earlier
16	statement.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So you have ten
18	minutes.
19	MR. HILTZ: I do have ten minutes,
20	but I don't think I'm going to use it, given
21	that
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.

MR. HILTZ: Well, good afternoon everybody. Many thanks to the NOP and the NOSB for continuing to allow us to provide public comment on organic issues, and welcome to the new board members who I have not met before, and we appreciate your commitment that you've put in for the next five years.

My name is Dave Hiltz. I'm a research scientist with Acadian Sea Plants.

Acadian Sea Plants is one of the largest manufacturers of aquatic plant extracts in the world.

located We're in Nova Scotia, Canada, and our company has supplied both kelp meal and the synthetic aquatic plant extracts to growers for use in both organic conventional agriculture for the past years. We certainly continue to hope continue to do so in the future.

I come before you today to comment on your ongoing sunset process for the existing national list, and specifically the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

recommendation of the Crops Committee for the renewal of aquatic plant extracts under 205.601(j).

Acadian Sea Plants mostly agrees with the findings of the committee, and also of the TAP review panel, and we're pleased with the recommendation of the committee to review aquatic plant extracts.

The majority of the comments that I have today are going to focus on the discussion of some of the points that have been contained in some of the earlier public comments, and again give Acadian Sea Plants' opinions on some of the comments that you've heard.

One of the big issues that continues to be the issue to arise seems of potential for aquatic plant extract manufacturers somehow fortify their to extracts with potassium, through the excess use of alkali during the extraction process.

I certainly can't speak for all

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

companies, but I will again reiterate what I've said at all the meetings that I've attended, that for our company that simply is not a possibility.

The extraction process that we use was developed in conjunction with research scientists at the National Research Council of Canada, and it is very sensitive to the amount of alkali that we use.

If we put in too much alkali, it causes us major production problems. If we put in too little alkali, it causes us major production problems. So we spend a lot of time within the company, in our quality control process, to make sure that we use only the minimal amount that is required with our established process to produce a quality product.

One of the things I've also heard stated is that these products, if you look on the Armory list, for example, you'll see that the potassium level varies more between two

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and 20 percent.

What no one has mentioned is the fact that those products also vary in solids content widely. Some of those are very, very dilute liquids; some of those are dry soluble powders.

If you were to actually put the potassium content in context of the actual dry matter of all those products, you would find that any of them that are alkali-extracted made with potassium are all going to come in at almost the same level.

The fact that one of them is a ten percent solution, of course it's going to lower the potassium level down. So that's where some of the confusion comes in there.

But the suggestion that alkali extraction allows us to market potassium fertilizers at an elevated price is simply without merit.

These products, as Gerald pointed out this morning, are applied at the level of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

ounces and maybe pounds per acre, and the agronomic impact of applying that to a crop is simply insignificant.

At the recommended application guidelines, our products would supply considerably less than one percent of the required potassium for a field crop. Given the cost factors involved, it simply is not going to be economically feasible for a farmer to over-apply that.

Even if they did try to do that, aquatic plant extracts made from marine plants contain a natural level of sodium that is about one-third of what the level of potassium is in the final product.

So even if you did try to over-apply that, you would end up, if you tried to, for example, apply 20 pounds of potassium through over-applying aquatic plant extract, you would inadvertently apply six or seven pounds of sodium. You could see that very quickly it's going to run into causing a salinity issue.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

So we just don't feel that that is a viable possibility that anybody could do that.

A number of commenters have also commented on the use of potassium carbonate as an appropriate alkali to use. Indeed, a number of our competitors do use that product now.

Acadian Sea Plants has no comment one way or the other on that. It certainly is a viable alkali to also use. The one thing I will point out is that in our opinion, in our experience, anybody that is using potassium carbonate is doing it using a pressurized extraction process, whether instead of extract —

For example, our company extracts at an ambient temperature and pressure. With the use of the carbonate, which is not as strong of an alkali, you have to account for that by usually using high pressure and high temperatures, usually on the order of 300 to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

350 degrees Fahrenheit.

So there isn't -- that process is viable, but it is a different process than what we do, and certainly we wanted to point that out to the board as well.

One of the other issues that we've talked about is the existence of some of these non-synthetic type extracts. Indeed, the study that Armory had commissioned had looked at the viability of whether or not alkali extracts were needed.

In that -- some people have concluded that from that report, that there's a statement that or there's a conclusion that the alkali extracts are not needed.

It's unclear to us how they could come to that conclusion, given that on page four in the statements, there's an ambiguous statement where they say that, I quote here, "Both alkali and non-alkali extracts may have some value in crop treatments, although it is clear that the latter" --

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

"It is not clear that the latter," which would be the non-alkali extracts, can provide responses comparable to alkali extracts.

Yet later in the same statement, they say it is possible to establish -- it's not possible to establish the necessity of alkali potassium hydroxide in the making of extracts.

Well, if there's no clear evidence that the non-alkali extracts work as well as the alkali extracts, how can you conclude that the non-alkali extracts, that alkali is not required? That's very, you know, confusing to us.

And also the other thing I would point out is the fact that some of these non-alkaline extracts, which you would think would be totally natural and non-synthetic, we don't disagree that there are processes out there that will allow for the manufacture of a non-synthetic extract.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

The problem then becomes is the same problem that all of us have, is trying to bottle that into something that's shelf-life stable. You can certainly use pressurized, differential pressures, freezing, thawing.

But at the end of that, you'll end up with a seaweed suspension usually, that again is going to be -- if you can't find some way to preserve it or stabilize it, it's going to be susceptible to microbial action.

So some of these products that are on the marketplace, even though they say well, we don't use alkali, we don't use any synthetic chemicals in the extraction process.

"No, you don't." But a lot of them do, then subsequently add synthetic micronutrients or synthetic preservatives to stabilize their products.

So even though it looks like it's non-synthetic, it may not really be.

So in closing, I just, you know, I just want to again thank the board for their

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

continued work on this, and we again thank you for your proposal that for the renewal of aquatic plant extracts as they're currently listed.

Given that a number of us, the manufacturers produce these products in such different ways, with respect to the question of trying to limit the amount of alkali or set some number for the amount of alkali, we would suggest that would be a difficult process.

We certainly will work with the board, if that's something they choose to do. But we'll warn you that that is -- again, given all the different types of manufacturing of the alkali extracts out there, it would be very difficult to establish one of those as being an official process, so to speak. So I thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Thank you, David.

On the very -- the last line on the very first page of your presentation, I want to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	make sure I understand what you're saying. Is
2	there a typo? Are you trying to say "thus
3	rendering them synthetic, despite the lack of
4	chemicals used"?
5	Should that be "Instead, they are
6	often mixed with synthetic micronutrients."
7	Is this what I'm reading?
8	MR. HILTZ: Yes.
9	MEMBER ENGELBERT: This is where
10	MR. HILTZ: Yes. It says they're
11	often mixed with synthetic micronutrients or
12	preservatives that produce a shelf-stable
13	product, thus rendering them non-synthetic"
14	yes. That's kind of what I was saying before.
15	MEMBER ENGELBERT: It should say
16	"synthetic"?
17	MR. HILTZ: Yes. I apologize. Yes,
18	you're right. That should be "synthetic."
19	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. Lou
21	Anderson is up next, and I've been asked to
22	make an announcement. It's hotel policy not

to bring food into this room for eating. 1 So 2 I'm sorry. I'm making the announcement. MR. ANDERSON: I'm Lou Anderson. 3 Ι Idaho Organic Feed 4 represent Growers 5 Association. I apologize, but I need to talk about the pasture issue again. 6 7 a group of 60 represent organic farmers, all family farmers in Idaho. 8 We produce organic feed for organic dairies. 9 We're in an area that's kind of unique. 10 11 produce organic feed there efficiently and in sustainable, 12 а very 13 friendly manner. the elevation and 14 Because of moisture that we get there, and the growing 15 16 conditions, the short growing season, we take 17 generally just one cutting of hay. Our barley 18 yields, we can only grow short season grains 19 because of the climate. 20 Our barley yields are usually 20 to 21 30 bushels per acre. So the natural

calcification or natural state of the soil

pretty much takes care of our soil fertility.

We don't have a lot of weed problems there, we don't have a lot of insect problems there, so it's just a natural place for that to happen. Unfortunately, that's about the only crop that we can grow there. We don't have a lot of crop choices.

This is my first experience at one of these meetings, and it's been All of you guys on the board, enlightening. on the NOP, I really appreciate your patience what you do, because it's times in at certainly it's not much fun.

support pasture for organic We dairies. that prescribed Our concern is of pasture amounts may put unnecessary burdens on economic some of the Western dairies.

We would support focusing more on the overall animal health and welfare than on whether the only feed those animals get is pasture.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Our concern is that if this takes place, these dairies may not be able to operate financially and would go out of business, and we have established over the last ten years a market for about 60,000 acres' worth of organic feed.

We produce in the neighborhood of 100,000 tons of organic feed every year, which we're able to market at this time. It injects in the neighborhood of 15 to 20 million dollars a year into the economy of our area.

A number of the farmers that I represent, probably half would tell you that if it was not for the organic industry and for their ability to farm organically and produce and sell organically that they would not be farming now.

It's a problem in our area that the land values have become so high that sometimes it's easier to sell than it is to continue farming. Because of organics and because of organic feed production, we have been able to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

keep most of these farmers on the land.

I'm a fourth generation Idaho farmer. Most of the people I came here today to talk for are second, third and fourth generation Idaho farmers. We just feel that maybe we haven't been heard or people don't know who we are.

So they sent me out here to introduce myself and introduce us to you guys.

Like I said, we feel that what we do that we're very strongly supportive of the organic program and the organic rules.

We feel we produce a very organic, very nutritious product something, like I said, in a very friendly, earth friendly, very sustainable manner, and we'd like you to consider our position in this in the dairy question, that we may continue to do that and may continue to grow that industry as the organic dairy industry goes in our area.

I think it's important that organic dairy products are produced in a manner that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	are affordable to the general public. I see
2	that happening now. I'd like to see that stay
3	the same way if we can do that.
4	I appreciate your time. Thank you.
5	Yes sir.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Lou.
7	MEMBER DAVIS: What part of Idaho
8	are you located in?
9	MR. ANDERSON: We're in South
10	Central Idaho.
11	MEMBER DAVIS: Name some cities.
12	MR. ANDERSON: We're about 50 miles
13	west of Sun Valley.
14	MEMBER DAVIS: Okay. So you're
15	between
16	MR. ANDERSON: We're north of Twin
17	Falls.
18	MEMBER DAVIS: Okay, between
19	MR. ANDERSON: Between Boise in the
20	north. Actually, we have growers that go from
21	the Boise Valley to the Teton Valley, and from
22	Snowville, Utah the other way.

1	MEMBER DAVIS: Okay. So you're all
2	across that broad patch of land?
3	MR. ANDERSON: All across that broad
4	band, yes sir. Yes.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Thank you very
6	much for coming in and taking your time out.
7	All I can say is there's a lot of Eastern
8	organic dairy farms that love Western hay. It
9	certainly would be nice to see some of or
10	more of your hay come into the East.
11	MR. ANDERSON: I've been contacted
12	by a number of people. Unfortunately at this
13	point, the freight is seems to be
14	prohibitive.
15	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, but still,
16	the organic farmers right here in Pennsylvania
17	will buy hay from organic hay from Nebraska
18	and what-not. So please keep us in mind on
19	this end of the country.
20	MR. ANDERSON: That's what we do for
21	a living. We'd be glad to bring it any place
22	we can.

(Laughter.) 1 2 MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, there's been 3 a shortage, this year especially. You've got another question. 4 5 MEMBER SMILLIE: One cut, because that's the length of the season or --6 7 MR. ANDERSON: Because that's the length of the season and the moisture we have. 8 We have maybe 18 or 19 inches of moisture, 9 but most of it comes in the form of snow in 10 11 the winter. During the last 12 ten years of drought, we've gotten about half a cutting. 13 So the organic has made that so we could still 14 continue to survive. If not for that, I'm 15 sure we'da been out of business. 16 17 MEMBER SMILLIE: Is that irrigated 18 or natural? 19 MR. ANDERSON: Most of the acres are 20 natural, non-irrigated. There is some

irrigation, but most of it's natural non-

irrigated.

21

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. 1 2 MEMBER KARREMAN: Thank you, Lou. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Cayse Warf is up, 3 and next on deck, Gwendolyn Ward. 4 5 WARF: Good day. My name is MR. I work with EcoLab. 6 Cayse Warf. 7 interest in daily cow health special welfare through teat dips and hair hoof wart 8 treatments, and also food safety assurance 9 during processing through the use of 10 11 contact antimicrobials, and efficacious applications of oxidants for cleaning and 12 13 sanitizing. I really appreciate the work for the 14 NOSB and the NOP, especially you guys that are 15 16 volunteering. Keep going. However, I have a 17 couple of concerns and some suggestions I 18 would like to share with you this morning. 19 Similar in some ways, I think that the process is kind of like the reproduction 20 21 of elephants. After the initial courtship 22 rituals, it takes about two years to get a product. So let's work on that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It seems -- well, I won't even go into that. Where is our *Federal Register* publication for peracetic acid? I think I know the answer right now. I've talked with Arthur and some others in there.

But you've already made your recommendations. Now is it going to take two years before we get a publication, so that we can go ahead and start using that? It should not be that way.

A couple of things that I'd like to mention too is the inconsistency in certifiers. Yesterday, it was very interesting to me to see the Shiitake mushroom presentation here, that they had been using the process for years and years, okay, with multiple certifiers, okay.

No problem with at all. You come up with one certifier that says "Well, that's an input," instead of a plastic bag and whatever else. It should not be that way. It should

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

not be that way, that certifiers can be willynilly in their certification or what they're requiring.

Another example is recently, we had a customer using a material on poultry processing for chicken carcasses. One certifier had no problem at all, seeing that it was under an advisement letter from USDA, that it was a food contact substance.

Another certifier in another state says "No, it's not. We disagree with that. We don't go along with the recommendations from USDA," and they would not certify it. It should not be that way, that one certifier can allow it and another should not. That needs to be fixed.

So I called on the NOP quickly to address food contact substances, and quickly rule that they are not under the jurisdiction of the NOSB.

Or I propose that the NOP create a new category called "Food safety

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

antimicrobials," including all substances codified in 21 C.F.R. 173, which is secondary, direct food additives, and legislate that their automatic inclusion by reference in the NOP list, and not require them to go through the listing process on the NOP.

understand that the NOP is Т marketing program, so it should not trump food at safety in any aspect all. Organic consumers expect and deserve that the organic labeled meat, poultry, fish, fruits vegetables are as safe from pathogens as nonorganically processed food. Right now, that is not 100 percent certain. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. Any questions? Gwendolyn. I'd just remind everybody we still have 90 minutes of public comment to go, and the board needs to do some deliberation on these action items.

MS. WYARD: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the NOSB, NOP staff and ladies and gentlemen of the gallery. My name

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is Gwendolyn Wyard. I'm the primary processing program reviewer at Oregon Tilth, representing 744 members and 411 certified processors.

I'm pleased to be here today and provide comments regarding the retention of flavors. My comments were submitted on April  $10^{\rm th}$ , so hopefully you have those in your book.

While the committee recommendation refers to both flavors and colors, I am going to focus my comments today on flavors, keeping in mind that most of my comments also apply to agricultural colors.

Oregon Tilth does not support the retention of the current listing of flavors, but rather supports transition to a defined inclusion of non-agricultural flavors, as per the 205.605 heading.

I'd like to recognize and emphasize right here from the starting gate that complete elimination of flavors from 205.605 would be premature. I agree with that,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

because non-agricultural, non-synthetic flavors, they arguably exist.

However, many flavors are agricultural by current rule definition, and would be more appropriately listed under 205.606, if not commercially available in organic form.

So the current listing of flavors is too broad, and I think we agree. We agree with that. The FDA definition of natural flavor ranges from simple botanical extracts or essential oils such as peppermint extract, lemon oil to the aroma chemicals that Tony Ingredients mentioned Moore from Moore earlier, 6-3-hexanol (ph), acetic acid, etcetera, etcetera, to protein hydrolyzates (ph) and fermentation products. Then there's the complex mixtures of agricultural and nonagricultural.

So the crux of the situation is this: I want to use peppermint extract as an example. It's a simple botanical extract.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

They're generally accepted as agricultural.

It does not meet the definition of nonagricultural, and it's readily available in
organic form.

However, because peppermint extract meets the broad FDA definition of natural flavor, and flavors are listed under 205.605 as non-agricultural, the peppermint extract is regarded as non-agricultural, and the non-organic form is consequently allowed in organic products.

The manufacturer of the organic product is neither required to source or use organic peppermint extract.

So while one company is required to spend considerable money and resources to secure a consistent supply or organic guargum (ph) or organic mustard brand, another organic product manufacturer may use non-organic peppermint oil as a flavor, regardless of its organic availability. This does not support the production of organic ingredients.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

I wanted to mention or comment, you mentioned earlier, Joe, that efforts are being made to encourage manufacturers to use organic flavors. I honestly don't know how we can do that.

A clarification came from the NOP on the form of a letter from Richard Matthews to Richard Segal, when Grace Merriquen (ph) was requesting that manufacturer be required to use organic yeast.

That letter clearly stated that if manufacturers were going to be required to use organic yeast, it would need be reclassified as agricultural. I'm sifting and sorting through formulations every day, and I'm seeing rosemary oil and peppermint extracts.

I would like to do a case-by-case determination and say "Well, the heading here is non-agricultural. This here is an agricultural flavor." But if the operator comes to me and submits it as natural flavor,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and points to 605, legally I feel like my hands are tied.

So what I'd like to recommend is that once again, we support the transition to a listing of non-agricultural flavors. A thorough investigation into flavor composition and manufacturing practices should inform the determination and long-term retention of solely non-agricultural, non-synthetic flavors.

Organic status should be required for agricultural flavors unless petitioned under 205.606, and during the interim that a broad category of flavors remains on 605.

Guidance distinguishing agricultural flavor from non-agricultural flavors should be operative to aid and evaluation of 205.606 flavor petitions, and create consistent verification among accredited certifiers.

I spend a lot of time calling up certifiers and asking them how they're dealing with flavors, and it's across the board. So

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	thank you very much for this opportunity.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gwendolyn, yes.
3	So really, I guess what you're saying is that
4	there's a need for flavors to be in both
5	locations?
6	MS. WYARD: I think so, absolutely,
7	absolutely, and I think that the heading
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And I think there
9	are people on this board that agree with that.
10	So that would help us if somebody filed a
11	petition for 606 for flavors.
12	MS. WYARD: Joe?
13	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes. Two things.
14	Number one, we didn't get your paper. So if
15	you could just make sure whatever, resubmit it
16	or whatever we have to do, Because I would
17	like to have it.
18	I absolutely agree with you. We're
19	in a legal bind. I think a position that
20	certifiers take is to still, in spite of that
21	legal definition, to still push for organic
22	flavors. I think manufacturers also, even

1	though not legally required to move towards
2	more and more organic flavors, do so also for
3	marketing reasons.
4	If they can find something
5	acceptable, I think it aids their process. So
6	you're absolutely right. We have no legal
7	authority to make them comply with commercial
8	availability Because of that issue.
9	But nonetheless, I think we have
10	moral suasion and I know that there's also
11	some there are some marketing benefits to
12	moving towards flavors. But I absolutely
13	agree with every word you said. It was
14	accurate and that's the way we have to move.
15	MS. WYARD: Okay, thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you,
17	Gwendolyn. Tina pardon me?
18	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Make sure you send
19	us your document so it gets into the meeting
20	book. But I'm sure we have it just for the
21	record.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Tina Ellor,

and I'm going to make an announcement that this will be the last speaker we have, and the board is going to break, because I'm going to have mutiny here if I don't let everybody get out and get something to eat.

So we're going to take, and I don't know what, 30 minutes, 40 minutes. They're

know what, 30 minutes, 40 minutes. They're reserving a spot for us at the salad bar in the restaurant.

So I'm assuming 40 minutes or so, and then we're going to come back and then pick up with public comment, and that will be with Leslie Zuck. So thank you.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Then you're going to break again for a working discussion?

After you hear the public comment, then you'll stop again for your working --

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I think we need to talk when we're having lunch for the committees, what they may need, if there's still additional public comment that comes afterwards where we need to do it. So we'll

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	kind of make that determination. Yes Eric?
2	MR. SIDEMAN: Those of us who are
3	going to come up for comment, because of your
4	break can we send in written comments?
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, I'm not
6	cutting anybody off.
7	MR. SIDEMAN: Because I have to
8	leave to make a plane by 3:00.
9	MS. ELLOR: You want to take my
10	spot?
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That's perfectly
12	acceptable if
13	MR. SIDEMAN: Can I do it barefoot?
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Oh yeah.
15	MEMBER OSTIGUY: It's organic.
16	(Laughter.)
17	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Barefoot is
18	preferred.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Tina, thank you.
20	You'll be first up then when we come back.
21	MEMBER OSTIGUY: That was very nice.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Tina.

MR. SIDEMAN: Мy Eric 1 name's 2 Sideman, Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association. I just want to make a quick 3 comment about seaweed extracts. 4 5 There have been a number of comments about these, and one thing that has not been 6 7 considered and I think should be and put into the records, is that phosphoric acid has never 8 been reviewed, petitioned or approved by the 9 NOSB for use in this material. 10 11 There a number of companies are across the country that are using it. 12 Most 13 companies are not using it, and I think that needs to be addressed. Not during the sunset 14 review, but soon. 15 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Was it allowed in 16 17 the fish? MR. SIDEMAN: 18 Yes. That's the only -- and that has something to do with the way 19 20 that NOP is reorganizing the list. reorganize 21 the list so extractants and

are

listed individually,

22

stabilizers

then

1	phosphoric acid can be listed.
2	But again, it can't be listed with
3	annotation allowing it for seaweed, because
4	it's never been approved for that use. It's a
5	stabilizer. It lowers the pH so the
6	containers don't explode from microbial
7	activity. Questions?
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That was it?
9	Thank you, Eric.
10	MR. SIDEMAN: That's it. Thanks.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.
12	MEMBER DAVIS: Eric, is your
13	organization, would they be able to provide a
14	petition to get that on our plate?
15	MR. SIDEMAN: I'm a little reluctant
16	that our organization provide petitions,
17	because of conflict of interest. Even though
18	we've separated out our technical services
19	from our certification agency, I'd just really
20	rather stay away.
21	But I may be able to get some other
22	people to file petitions. In addition to

1	that, we'll be working with somebody to file a
2	petition for potassium carbonate.
3	As the gentleman from Acadian Sea
4	Plant pointed out, a lot of the major
5	companies across this country are using
6	potassium carbonate, and that too is not on
7	the list.
8	Again, the person who pointed out
9	the inconsistency of certifiers across the
10	country, this is an area where some certifiers
11	are allowing the seaweed extracts made with
12	potassium carbonate, and others are not, and
13	this is not fair to the companies who are
14	using it, two of which are in Maine, and we
15	don't allow it for use in Maine.
16	So it's a little bit of hostility at
17	our ag shows.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
19	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Very quickly.
20	Eric, why are all those companies being
21	allowed to use phosphoric acid if it's not

MR. SIDEMAN: It's an interpretation

1	actually, it's a tiny bit complicated. If
2	you take calcium carbonate and put it in
3	water, you actually will get some potassium
4	hydroxide.
5	So I think that's what some
6	certifiers are thinking, that you're making
7	potassium hydroxide. So potassium hydroxide's
8	on the list, so it's okay. But that's not the
9	way the list was meant to work. Potassium
10	carbonate is a different synthetic material.
11	If it's to be used in organic production, it
12	should be listed.
13	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Do you know what
14	that means? Okay.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur?
16	MR. NEAL: This issue goes back to
17	just how the list was constructed and
18	interpreted. As we mentioned yesterday, we're
19	going to undertake rulemaking to reorganize
20	the national list.
21	We do have a petition for the use of

phosphoric acid as a pH adjuster in aquatic

1	plant extracts. Depending on how this whole
2	rulemaking process works out, that petition
3	may just reenter, be resurrected and come
4	before the board for the petition, for the use
5	in which it was petitioned.
6	That way, that whole annotation
7	issue would be addressed, and hopefully the
8	whole potassium carbonate issue can get worked
9	on at the same time.
10	MR. SIDEMAN: Yes. I think that's
11	essentially all I'm asking, is that petitions
12	for potassium carbonate and phosphoric acid
13	for the use in plant extracts be moved
14	forward.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Eric.
16	MR. SIDEMAN: Thanks.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. We're going
18	to take a break and we're going to try for
19	to be back here at 2:30.
20	(Whereupon, at 1:50 p.m., a luncheon
21	recess was taken.)
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Tina, you will be

1	in the public record, and I'm sure people will
2	be coming in while you speak, if you don't
3	mind.
4	MS. ELLOR: It's okay. I'll be
5	very, very brief. I'm not even going to read
6	my comment. My name is Tina Ellor.
7	I'm from Phillips Mushroom Farms,
8	and also with the Organic Working Committee of
9	the American Mushroom Institute, and there's a
10	couple of issues I'd like to bring up very
11	quickly.
12	Number one, yeast as livestock. I'm
13	not real comfortable with that, because there
14	are five kingdoms. We classify all of life
15	into five kingdoms. Plant and animal are just
16	two. There are three more. I'd be more
17	comfortable with an additional category of
18	"Other" or something like that.
19	Those classifications, of course,
20	are based on a lot of different things, and
21	that information's very useful. But I'd like

to just mention that if you start putting, you

know, different organisms into different kingdoms than where they belong, than what's to say now mushrooms aren't livestock, and will have trouble with pasture access.

But also we've finally gotten comfortable certifying under the crop standard. Now we had a mushroom standard very far into progress, and the NOP decided not to go forward with it.

If you guys decide to go with a mushroom standard, I still have all the work we did on that originally. So if that comes up on your docket, I'll dig those files out and maybe save us all a lot of time.

The second issue is hydrated lime, and that came up on a number of different things. But we use hydrated lime as pest control in mushroom cultivation, and it's very critical to control green mold, trichoderma harzianum, of which has caused massive losses in the mushroom industry.

I won't bore you with the nuts and

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

bolts, but if it comes up later and you want to know how we use it and why, I'll be here.

The third thing is just a brief word for those mushroom growers who use cheesewax on their Shiitake logs. You couldn't ask for -- and I understand the issue, but you couldn't ask for better people making a better product.

If you line up all the Shiitakes grown in the world, you know, those would be the best. Shiitake comes in massive quantities from Asia. Often it goes through Japan. The lentinen is extracted to use for cancer therapy. The mushrooms are dried and sold here.

Now those people are competing against that kind of product and just massive amounts of imports coming in. What they have is a product that's grown outside in the sun, which is different from what we do. We grow everything inside under lights.

Their product is actually more

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	nutritious and better quality, and that
2	organic certification means a lot to them. So
3	if there's some way, you know, that we could
4	work with this, I think it would be greatly
5	appreciated.
6	The last thing I'd like to say is
7	I'm sure a lot of us got that little card in
8	the mail that said there are openings on the
9	NOSB and did not respond, as I didn't, because
10	of the huge commitment you guys make. I just
11	want to tell you how much I appreciate that.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.
13	Questions?
14	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Could you very
15	quickly go through how you use hydrated lime,
16	just real
17	MS. ELLOR: Sure. Hydrated lime is
18	used to adjust the ph of the casing material,
19	because the weed mold, trichoderma harzianum,
20	green mold likes very acidic conditions, as
21	most fungi do.

We need to raise the pH quickly, and

1	to a pretty high point, to have the Agericus,
2	the Portobellas white mushrooms, compete
3	against that green mold. Conventional growers
4	use fungicide in the compost, in the casing,
5	and to coat the spawn.
	_
6	Of course, you know, we don't have
7	that option and we wouldn't use it even if we
8	did.
9	MEMBER ENGELBERT: And why hydrated
10	lime and not conventional ground limestone?
11	MS. ELLOR: Because you have to use
12	so much conventional ground limestone to raise
13	the pH that it changes the structure of the
14	casing soil, and it doesn't function nearly as
15	well. That's what we've used up until like
16	1954, just a whole lot of crushed limestone.
17	But these new virulent strains of
18	trichoderma came in in the early 80's and just
19	completely wiped out huge amounts of crops.
20	So I just wanted to mention that.
21	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. Leslie

Zuck. Okay, Emily, that's fine. Emily Brown-Rosen.

MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Hi. I'll try to make this really quick. I just wanted to -- I know this is not directly on agenda, but this issue on the replacement stock. I just you wanted to know -- I think this is in your packet.

A number of certifiers sent a letter a couple of weeks ago to the NOP. We've got Pennsylvania Certified Organic, Vermont Organic Farmers, Midwest Organic Services, NOFA New York, MOFCA, Steller, which is Demeter (ph), and Oregon Tilth, plus several NOBTA, MODPA, a couple of other farm groups, really asking NOP to look carefully at this upcoming opportunity when they have to rewrite the regs.

I mean, the certifiers have been concerned because we had no warning or guidance or proposed rule or what's going to happen, ad our understanding is the rule needs

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

to be changed by June  $9^{\text{th}}$  Because of the court case.

So at that point, animals can -- any 12-month old transition animal being brought onto any organic farm, or do we have a two-track system like we currently unfortunately do, or can we fix this once and for all?

So hopefully there will be an opportunity to comment soon when the NOP does post whatever they're going to do, and I hope you keep it on your work plan to respond promptly and hopefully support your previous positions on this, because this is a real opportunity to fix a problem that's been dragging on for a long time, and we need to do it now and not perpetuate this two-track thing.

So take a look at the letter if you need. We've given specific suggestions on how we thought the wording should look. I think it's not hard to fix. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Emily.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	There's a question from Hugh.
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, I was just
3	kind of wondering could the NOP give us any
4	inkling right now what's going to happen? I
5	mean we're in April right now, and it's going
6	to be June 9 <sup>th</sup> comes around, we're not going to
7	have to another major decisionmaking time.
8	Do you I mean, you know, it's
9	less than two months away when this all
10	changes. Could you give us an idea of what we
11	should expect?
12	MR. BRADLEY: Mark Bradley with the
13	NOP. We can't comment on that right now, but
14	you'll know very soon.
15	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. Before June
16	9 <sup>th</sup> ?
17	MR. BRADLEY: Yes.
18	MS. BROWN-ROSEN: Okay, thank you.
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: All right.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yeah. I think
21	Hugh it needs then to be, you know, it's a
22	work plan item on the Livestock Committee.

1	Yes, that as soon as that new ruling comes
2	out, then be prepared for any comments or
3	whatever we need to do.
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Absolutely.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. Did Leslie
6	come back? Leslie? You're up. You pass?
7	Well thank you. That doesn't mean we don't
8	love to hear from you. Okay. Tom Hutchinson,
9	and next on deck, Diane Goodman.
10	MR. HUTCHINSON: Tom Hutchinson,
11	Organic Trade Association. Thanks very much.
12	On commercial availability, thank you very
13	much for clarifying your discussion on the
14	role of NOSB's reviewing, rather than
15	evaluating information about commercial
16	availability.
17	This should lead to new insights
18	about how commercial availability is being
19	used, and we look forward to getting those
20	petitions moving.
21	OTA supports strict criteria for

certifiers to

22

determine commercial

availability plus training, and of course NOP attention to the issue as necessary.

We all support Kim Dietz's comments, especially returning to the previous NOSB recommendation, recommending three attempts to find -- a minimum of three attempts to find a product.

Please also review ag versus non-ag status, and see our written comments for yet another reason to include yeast and microorganisms as agricultural product. Even if yeast is not livestock, it is non-plant life. So there is precedent in the rule for some consideration.

On the framework for clarifying the definition of synthetic, OTA supports the framework and has suggested two tweaks, including having fungi and microorganisms in the definition of "natural source."

As always, please look at our written comments, and you can see what OTA's comment really are, as opposed to uninformed

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

rumors. On our website, when we get them up 1 probably in about a week, ota.com, 2 "Public Policy," available to the public for 3 inspection. Thanks. 4 5 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Tom. Hi again. 6 MS. GOODMAN: Just as a 7 clarification on comment that Ι а made yesterday, I'd like to offer the clarification 8 to the comment I made, and that while 9 yesterday reflected the comment 10 11 Florida Crystals, today I would like comment to be reflected in their comment. 12 13 My separate -- my previous comment 14 referred to -- you understand what I meant, right? I said it wrong. My comment yesterday 15 16 17 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: When you come up, 18 you're a different person. So I'm sorry. MEMBER KARREMAN: You are you today. 19 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Oh, he's confused. 20 I'm Diane Goodman, and 21 MS. GOODMAN: 22 yesterday I read a comment from Steve Clark

1	from Florida Crystals, and I made a comment as
2	well.
3	In both of those comments and in the
4	comment you received and I handed you from
5	Florida Crystals, the comment I made to you
6	personally yesterday reflected the comment
7	that was submitted by Florida Crystals and
8	Steve Clark.
9	So in this comment, I would like you
LO	to take these words now and reflect them back
L1	on those comments, because I'm not commenting
L2	on behalf of Steve Clark or Florida Crystals.
L3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And you do not
L4	have a proxy?
L5	MS. GOODMAN: And I don't have a
L6	proxy, not even for me. So you understand
L7	now?
L8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes.
L9	MS. GOODMAN: All right. My
20	previous comment referred to a disagreement
21	that we held, with the suggestion that in the
2.2	clarification documents for the definition of

synthetic that a substance be defined as a 1 2 compound or element that had а distinct 3 identity, such as a separate CAS number. Tn the context of defining 4 5 synthetic as a substance that is created by chemical change, that produces a separate and 6 7 entirely new substance, that all synthetics may be distinct compounds or elements, we'd 8 like to keep in mind that while all substances 9 10 are --11 While all synthetics may be distinct 12 elements, all compounds compounds or or elements may not be synthetic, simply Because 13 they are created by chemical change. Do you 14 all understand what I'm trying to say? 15 16 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Uh-huh. 17 MS. GOODMAN: And Kevin, I wonder if 18 you -- and thank you for that. My apologies 19 for the convoluted and confused nature of 20 that. Can you clarify something you said 21

right before we broke, and that was you said

1	you urged people to get a petition in for
2	colors or flavors, I think you said, a
3	petition in for flavors.
4	I think you might have meant to get
5	petitions in for flavors.
6	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
7	MS. GOODMAN: Correct?
8	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
9	MS. GOODMAN: Okay, great. Thank
10	you very much. Any questions about what I
11	said? Okay, thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Diane.
13	Miles McEvoy? On deck
14	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Scheide.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I don't know.
16	MR. McEVOY: Hello. I'm Miles
17	McEvoy with the Washington State Department of
18	Agriculture. Thanks for sticking in there and
19	listening to all the comments.
20	I have some prepared comments that I
21	gave to Valerie, that you'll get a copy of,
22	and okay. So let's get through I'm going

to talk about some tree fruit here.

The Washington State Department of Agriculture certified over 550 organic crop producers last year, and nearly half of these producers are growing organic tree fruit, mostly apples and pears, cherries, a lot of peaches, nectarines and apricots as well.

Washington State produces 58 percent of the U.S. apple crop, and over 50 percent of the U.S. pear crop. In 2003, organic tree fruit comprised 4.7 percent of the state's apple acreage, and over six percent of the pear acreage.

So ti's a very significant part of the state's organic production, and the tree fruit industry in the state is very excited about organic growing. Because of the strong market, there are thousands of acres of tree fruit that are in transition to organic production.

The environment benefits of organic food production are widely recognized. An

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

additional benefit of organic production is that organic farms are laboratories of new pest control techniques.

Pest control methods such as mating disruption were pioneered on organic farms, and are now the standard for pest management of coddling moth (ph) in conventional tree fruit operations as well.

The tree fruit industry, the conventional fruit tree industry has significantly reduced the amount of organic phosphates, carbonomates (ph) and organic chlorine pesticides due to the pest control advances pioneered by organic growers.

I'm going to specifically talk about streptomycin and tetracycline. Fire blight is a common and very destructive bacterial disease of apples and pears. The disease is so named because infected leaves will suddenly turn brown, appearing as though they have been scorched by fire.

Pears are very susceptible to fire

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

blight as well as certain apple varieties such as Braeburn, Pink Lady, Fuji and Gala. Older varieties such as Red Delicious are fairly resistant.

So if fire blight is not controlled, it can lead to the death of a tree, with significant financial loss due to loss of production and need to replace the tree.

Cultural practices can reduce fire blight pressures. Biologicals such as Blight Ban can help reduce fire blight occurrence, but do not completely eliminate the danger. New biologicals are being developed and look promising and may be commercial available within the next few years.

Streptomycin and tetracycline are needed to protect organic tree fruit orchards during severe fire blight outbreaks, especially when there's a lot of moisture. This year is going to be one of those times. We're having a very wet winter.

Over the next few years, viable

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

alternatives should be available that could eliminate the continued need of these materials in both organic and conventional tree fruit production.

Moving on floating agents, pear floats that are used in post-harvest handling. Pears are heavy and they need a floating agent in order to raise the specific gravity to enable the pears to float. Lignin sulfonate was the preferred floating agent in the mid-90's.

Dr. Eugene Kupferman (ph) conducted a survey of packing sheds in 1997, and found that sheds were using 68 percent lignin sulfonate, 16 percent sodium silicate, and 16 percent sodium sulfate.

In 2005, Organic packing sheds, which is about ten years, were using two-thirds of organic packing sheds were using sodium silicate, and that's due to increased restrictions on the use of lignin sulfonate by waste treatment plants.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

The waste treatment plants don't like the lignin sulfonate because it blocks sunlight and decreases the efficacy of the waste water treatment practices.

An alternative to pear floats are packing lines that use floatless dumpers. Floatless dumpers are the standard in Europe, but they're just recently starting to be adopted in the U.S.

But there's a large capital investment. The larger packing sheds can certainly afford that and they're moving in that direction. But there's a lot of smaller organic packing sheds that are going to find it difficult to have the capital to rebuild their packing lines.

So WSDA supports the continued allowance of lignin sulfonate and sodium silicate for floating tree fruit, and also the tetracycline and the streptomycin.

We also support the continued allowance of sodium hypochloride, chlorine

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	dioxide, horticultural oils for insect and
2	disease control, hydrated lime, hydrogen
3	peroxide for disinfectant and disease control,
4	streptomycin, tetracycline, humic acids,
5	lignin sulfonate and also for livestock the
6	continued listing of hydrated lime.
7	We also support the NOP to enforce
8	the pasture standard. I don't like the 30
9	percent DMI 120-day requirement. I think
10	there's other ways to get the to enforce the
11	access to pasture, that a pasture-based
12	management for livestock. So thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
14	MEMBER CAROE: Miles, how would it
15	affect your growers in Washington if sodium
16	silicate was retained, but lignin sulfonate
17	was not?
18	MR. McEVOY: They'd probably all
19	switch to sodium silicate.
20	MEMBER CAROE: But there's no reason
21	why they wouldn't be able
22	MR. McEVOY: They prefer the lignin

1	sulfonate, from what I understand. But
2	because of the waste treatment plants that
3	don't like it, so they've been shifting over
4	to sodium silicate.
5	MEMBER CAROE: So environmentally,
6	there would be a preference if they switched
7	over? I mean you're saying there's a water
8	quality issue with lignin sulfonate?
9	MR. McEVOY: It's not apparently
10	the waste, as I understand it, the waste
11	treatment plants, it's not a water quality
12	thing, but it affects the biological activity
13	in the waste treatment plans, because it
14	blocks the sunlight.
15	So in those packing sheds that
16	release their water to a municipality, to a
17	municipal waste treatment plant, they're
18	required not to use lignin sulfonate. So they
19	have to use alternatives like sodium silicate.
20	MEMBER ENGELBERT: What is the end
21	result then of, in those treatment plants, of

22

using that?

1	MR. McEVOY: What's the end result
2	of sodium silicate?
3	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No, the one
4	that's blocking out
5	MR. McEVOY: The lignin sulfonate?
6	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
7	MR. McEVOY: Well, they used to
8	accept lignin sulfonate, as I understand it.
9	But it decreased the biological activity. So
10	now they're restricting the what happened
11	to the lignin sulfonate? I don't
12	MEMBER ENGELBERT: The decrease in
13	biological activity resulted in?
14	MR. McEVOY: Less efficient process
15	in their water treatment, Because it would
16	block the sunlight to increase the biological
17	activity that they wanted, in terms of
18	treating the water.
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Basically what
20	happens is in the secondary treatment, the use
21	microorganisms to extract the nutrients out of
22	the water.

1	If you have sunlight being blocked,
2	then that extraction of the nutrients out of
3	the water is not occurring. So you end up
4	with more nutrients in your effluent that's
5	eventually dumped into your stream, which
6	obviously is produces algae and grasses.
7	MEMBER ENGELBERT: That's what I
8	wanted to make sure of.
9	MEMBER SMILLIE: Could you give us
10	some sort of your projection, your best
11	guesstimate of how many years you think that
12	we need to rely on streptomycin and
13	tetracycline? What's it look like? Do people
14	realize there's pressure on those?
15	MR. McEVOY: Yes. It's both the
16	conventional and organic growers that are
17	trying to find alternatives, because for
18	export markets, there's some restrictions on
19	the use of Microshield in particular.
20	So growers only use it when they
21	have to use it, and that's when they're going

to lose their orchard. There's a lot of

Τ	things you can do. Even if you have a little
2	bit of fire blight, you can go in with
3	cultural practices and cut it out.
4	You can use Blight Ban, which is a
5	competitive inhibitor, and apparently there's
6	a new competitive inhibitor that goes into the
7	infection sites of the where the fire
8	blight organism attacks the blossom in the
9	tree, and that one's supposed to be very
10	effective. There were some very good results
11	last year. How many years
12	I think there's going to be a
13	commercial product available next year.
14	MEMBER SMILLIE: Will it be
15	acceptable for use in organic?
16	MR. McEVOY: It should be, yes.
17	They're formulating it so it's supposedly
18	it hasn't been registered with Armory or WSDA,
19	but apparently that's what they're aiming for.
20	It's a biological, and they would want to get
21	it registered for use in organics.
	l <b>I</b>

MEMBER SMILLIE: Do you think it

1	would be fair to organic growers to say in
2	five years there will be a phase-out of the
3	use of streptomycin? I realize it depends on
4	the results of these tests, but if
5	MR. McEVOY: Right. The initial
6	research trials look good. On a broad scale,
7	to see how it works, we'll see over the next
8	few years on how effective it is.
9	There's a lot of pressure to find an
10	alternative, not just from the organic
11	community but also from other buyers, yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
13	MEMBER KARREMAN: Joe got my
14	question. Thanks.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
16	MEMBER JAMES: So what I hear you
17	saying is both the conventional and the
18	organic farmers are using streptomycin and
19	tetracycline?
20	MR. McEVOY: Yeah. I think it's the
21	oxytetracycline that they use primarily.
22	Microshield is the material.

MEMBER JAMES: Okay. Did you submit 1 your comments in writing? 2 MR. McEVOY: Yeah. 3 MEMBER DAVIS: So the material that 4 5 you reference that's being tested, I gather that it would be at the university level of 6 7 research at this point. So we can't say that it's on the market now? 8 9 MR. McEVOY: No. It's not on the It hasn't been EPA-registered. 10 market now. 11 They're working on the registration, as Ι understand it, and they're hoping to have a 12 commercially available product 13 distribution next year. 14 There's actually a few products that 15 16 are being worked on. The one that everybody's talking about, of being the most efficacious, 17 is Blossom something, Blossom Ban, something 18 like that. 19 20 both JAMES: So the MEMBER 21 commercial and the organic farms would 22 this alternative? I'm sorry.

MEMBER DAVIS: Conventional. 1 2 MEMBER JAMES: At retail, we say. The conventional 3 MR. McEVOY: Yes. farms also do not want to use Microshield or 4 5 the tetracycline or the streptomycin. would prefer not to. 6 7 prefer to would use а biological, because the whole tree 8 industry in the Northwest is moving to 9 integrated approach, using biologicals as much 10 11 as possible, so that you don't disrupt the 12 system. 13 The streptomycin and the tetracycline are going to disrupt the system, 14 biological, which 15 moreso than а is 16 competitive inhibitor at the in 17 orchard. 18 MEMBER JAMES: However, there's no way to -- or, I should ask. Would there be a 19 20 way, if these antibiotics were prohibited in 21 organic production, and an alternative came

about, would there be a way to enforce that

with the commercial or conventional apple 1 2 farms or no? McEVOY: If it's a 3 MR. No, no. registered pesticide, then they can use it as 4 5 per label directions, and it's their choice. But they're going to usually make the choice 6 7 that's best for their operation. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo. 8 MEMBER DELGADO: 9 Yes. The testing of these new materials, you said it's still at 10 11 the research level. Have they done commercial level testing? In other words, I'm 12 trying to get a feel of what the risk is of 13 not coming with a new product in the next two 14 or three years? 15 MR. McEVOY: I think there's a lot 16 There's a lot of people that are 17 of risk. 18 very excited about the research trials. I don't know the details of those 19 20 research trials, but they were on a more of --21 they were research trials on а commercial

basis, on experimental use permits.

They're not -- they're beyond 1 2 university level. They're beyond the lab level or the university research plots. 3 have been tested on a few commercial orchards. 4 5 Not organic orchards, but commercial orchards. 6 7 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh? MEMBER KARREMAN: I have a hard time 8 wrapping my arms around using the antibiotics 9 in the crops, because of the prohibitions in 10 11 other places in the program. MR. McEVOY: Right. 12 13 MEMBER KARREMAN: I'm just wondering 14 do you know the research, how it's going yourself, or you just know it's happening? 15 16 MR. McEVOY: I know it's happening. I'm not intimately familiar with it, no. 17 18 MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, one of the things I always think about when I'm studying 19 20 natural treatments for dairy cows and what-21 not, like the parasites, you know, you have to

kind of hit them in various stages of the life

cycle, you know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It's not just like input if you substitution, because start getting more foundation pillar effect, a multi-prong approach to the problem, what a professor might want to see is a total 100 percent equivalent compared to the streptomycin or tetracycline that's out there, whereas maybe in a product that doesn't need to be 100 percent equivalency but maybe 75 percent or something like that, it still might work with other biological management in place. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Because someone might say in a paper "This new research product we're working on is just not as good. Sorry, we need the streptomycin and tetracycline still."

MR. McEVOY: Yes.

MEMBER KARREMAN: But hopefully they're taking into account other management factors with that biological. So it's not just plain input substitution.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. McEVOY: Yes, and I think the organic growers are doing that at the current time. A lot of them choose not to use Microshield. For instance, if you use the antibiotic, the tetracycline, you lose your access to the European market because it's not allowed under European standards.

So the organic growers have a lot of pressure to not use the material, and for conventional growers, it's the same. It's an expensive material. If you can use -- there's already a biological on the market.

If you use cultural practices, which are both cleaning out any of the fire blight that occurs in the orchard, and also having an open orchard, appropriate pruning to keep the air flow, you can use wind machines to help with the air flow.

You can do a lot of things to try to minimize the amount of fire blight that you have. But if it gets to be that you're having a lot of flagging, a lot of occurrence, and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

you're going to choose between losing your orchard or treating, then the grower, organic grower or conventional grower is going to go in there and use the Microshield.

MEMBER DAVIS: Well, you referenced the organic growers that are trying to pursue the European market, where the antibiotics are not allowed on fruit.

MR. McEVOY: Right.

MEMBER DAVIS: How long of a history are you familiar with, with how they're doing in their control measures on blight, using -- totally not using the antibiotics? Have they been doing this very long or is this new?

MR. McEVOY: It's going to depend on your location, because there's areas of our state that are wetter than others, and so those wetter areas are going to have higher fire blight pressure.

It's going to depend on your isolation from other orchards. But they're certainly orchards that have never used

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

tetracycline to protect them from fire blight.

So it's -- and there's others that use it occasionally.

I don't know, you know, we'd have to do some background checks, but I doubt there's organic orchards that use it year after year after year. It's only when the fire blight pressure is extreme, and you have the choice between losing your orchard or losing a bunch of trees and saving your crop.

MEMBER DAVIS: So are you familiar with growers who have been participating in a program that allows them to market to the EU with their fruit, and not using it for long periods of time?

MR. McEVOY: Right, and then I'm also familiar with growers that have been in the EU program for many years, and last year was also a heavy fire blight pressure year, and they had to take some of the blocks out of the program because of fire blight pressure.

MEMBER DAVIS: Thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.
2	MR. McEVOY: Okay, thanks.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Steffen Scheide.
4	I'm sure I got that wrong, and Dave Carter's
5	on deck.
6	MR. SCHEIDE: Hi. Good afternoon.
7	Thank you for this opportunity to speaking
8	before you this afternoon. I'm Steffen
9	Scheide. I'm affiliated with Summit Hill
10	Flavors, an organic certified manufacturer of
11	flavoring.
12	This afternoon, I'd like to speak
13	out for colors, and I urge this board to
14	retain colors exactly the way they are under
15	205.605(a). The reason is the
16	interrelationship between FDA and USDA rules
17	and regulations.
18	Colors are regulated by the FDA.
19	The reason for colors being regulated and
20	defined by the FDA is because of their
21	functionality in food; in other words, any
22	material whose significant function in food

ingredient is color in that food is a color.

Now I'm a product developer, and when I take non-organic-certified colors in my practice development, organic caramel color has become available recently. If it had not been for 605(a), that product would not have ever been in the marketplace.

Organic tumeric is a colorant. It is a 100 percent organic color. But here is my dilemma. With the exception of meat and egg products, the vast majority of food products in the marketplace are FDA-regulated.

Henceforth, I am using a colorant, I use tumeric as a color. because However, if there is no congruency between the NOP and FDA rules and regulations, because the NOP is a positive list for me; if it is not expressly on that list, the FDA tells me tumeric is a color. NOP tells The me Τ cannot Henceforth, I cannot use tumeric colorants. in organic products.

That is really why it should remain

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

under 205.605(a). Now I know it may sound complex, but I'd like to give you an example of where FDA and what we do in agriculture is a little bit different.

Let us take a look at coffee. Coffee is an agricultural product, but it is not a food because green coffee is not fit and suitable for human consumption.

It is a process of physical change through roasting which changes a green coffee bean into a raw material, which I then grind and I actually extract it.

Those of us who have had coffee this morning have had a food ingredient or a beverage. However, if you spill that coffee on your shirt and you eat your shirt, you're eating a food color.

If that coffee had become cold and I put it into a teramusu (ph), its primary function is flavoring, and I am actually consuming a flavor. The same item under FDA has three purposes.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	Now you see why there is a lot of
2	confusion, but I think there's a lot of
3	understanding of what these ingredients are,
4	because the FDA has definitions of these
5	products.
6	So again, thank you for this time,
7	and I strongly urge you to keep colors on the
8	national list. Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I have a question
10	for you. I must be slow here today. You're
11	going to have to this one by me. Tumeric,
12	which would be considered a color additive in
13	a food product, you can't add that because of
14	the NOP regulations
15	MR. SCHEIDE: If you remove it. The
16	NOP defines color and the FDA defines color.
17	In other words, in food products I am allowed
18	to use colors, non-synthetic, as they appear
19	on
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Color additives.
21	MR. SCHEIDE: Exactly, and organic
22	tumeric is exactly that, because in FDA food

1	products, the FDA determines that tumeric is a
2	color. Is that understandable? The usage
3	basis of colors in organic certified foods is
4	FDA, because FDA regulates the overall food
5	product.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It allows you to
7	use tumeric in an organic product?
8	MR. SCHEIDE: Yes, exactly. In FDA
9	products, but that are also organically
10	certified. Absolutely.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. So if you
12	have organic tumeric, you can use it in, let's
13	say, egg nog?
14	MR. SCHEIDE: Yeah, because of the
15	way the regulations read right now.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Right. So there's
17	not a problem?
18	MR. SCHEIDE: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.
20	MEMBER SMILLIE: Unless you change
21	the regulations.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Excuse me?

1	MEMBER SMILLIE: Unless it's taken
2	off
3	MR. SCHEIDE: Yes, unless it's taken
4	off. Then NOP tells me
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, if it's
6	taken off, then all colors, color additives
7	cannot be used in organic products unless you
8	would petition for the use specifically of
9	tumeric or if it was available organically, an
10	agricultural product available organically.
11	MR. SCHEIDE: And you'd almost have
12	to make an annotation as you're saying
13	"tumeric" as a spice and as a colorant.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Thank you.
15	Dave. Rick Segalla is next, on deck.
16	MR. CARTER: Dave Carter, National
17	Bison Association, National Pet Nutrition,
18	itinerant consultant and NOSB survivor. First
19	of all, congratulations to the new appointees.
20	You've got a wonderful and frustrating five
21	years ahead of you, and I think you'll enjoy
22	the experience.

1	I apologize for not being at the
2	orientation the other day like the other
3	former members. Some of us were under the
4	impression that this was just for the new
5	members. So I'm going to impart a few things
6	here towards the end.
7	I also want to recognize Valerie
8	Francis. I think one of the things as we left
9	the board, having the new executive director
10	come on is a great step forward for not only
11	the NOSB but for the organic program.
12	And I also want to congratulate Mark
13	Bradley and the NOP for the new spirit of
14	collaboration and engagement with the NOSB.
15	Plus it's kind of fun to deal with a guy that
16	looks a lot like Billy Bob Thornton.
17	(Laughter.)
18	MR. CARTER: Now, just a couple of
19	specific comments on some of the materials.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Was that
21	derogatory?
22	MR. CARTER: Not at all, not at all.

On the items this morning, first of all, I really appreciate the depth in which you're trying to sort through the streptomycin and tetracycline issue. I think there are a number of reasons to be concerned.

I would caution you though, not to aim all your ammunition at the antibiotic issue, because not only as Arthur said does OFPA relegate antibiotics to livestock; the rule as well compartmentalizes it there.

So it's not really a valid issue to use in terms of crops, although there are a lot of concerns about that. Ivermectin, I would like to see it disappear from the list. I think there are other alternatives that are coming about and I would encourage you to keep your eye on the whole issue of parasiticides, because I think there's some developments there that will continue to make improvement.

Now let me just -- I have about six things from a 30,000 foot view, that there are things I'd like to say that there are items I

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

wished I would have remembered to remember when I was on the board, on just some general quidance from an old geezer.

Number one is remember, and this is for the new board members particularly, remember that organics is about organics. We like to get involved in discussion about scale. Myself, I tend to be a big advocate of small farms.

But when it comes to interpreting a federal regulation, you determine the organic regulations based upon organics. You neither to raise the bar to try and prevent big producers from coming in, nor lower it to try and make it easier for them to come in.

Secondly, I would not hesitate -- I want to encourage the new board members -- do not hesitate to be an activist board. The organic community is best served when there's a healthy tension between the NOP and the NOSB.

It's not a tension about

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

personalities; it's a tension about the issue and working together to try and solve problems and bring different perspectives.

Third, if you have to make a choice of where to invest your time, invest your time at the committee level. The more work you do in your committees to really dissect things through, is less time that you have to spend doing committee work at the board level.

I would encourage you to trust your committees when they bring those things forward that they have done that work, and to rely on their judgment.

Use the board policy manual. It's a good tool, and make sure that you not only use it, but you continue to work on it and improve it, and use the past board members and their expertise. All of us are willing and able and very eager to work with you.

Then finally the last two things is that number one, if you have to say something very controversial, do your best to try and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

create a diversion ahead of time to get Dennis Blank out of the room.

(Laughter.)

MR. CARTER: And then finally, and you may want to take a pen and write this one down. This is a very important guidance, is that any time before you get on a conference call, make sure you understand how the mute button works on your telephone.

(Laughter; applause.)

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. We will always remember that, Dave. Thank you. Rick Segalla and Adam Eidinger.

MR. SEGALLA: My name's Rick Segalla. I'm an organic farmer from Connecticut. My words today are on the last third of gestation rule. I think that's very important.

The other, after having discussion on this 30 percent of pasture and 120 days, I still believe we need that because there's talk about putting a number of acres per cow.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Well, that rewards some and takes away from others, because it's not fair to the guy that's really trying to produce a good organic pasture by keeping his cows out there and improving his soil in that manner, where he can put four or five cows to the acre on there and obtain that 30 percent dry matter, where another guy puts two cows to the acre out there, only Because that's the acre requirement and feeds them in the barn and does nothing to improve the soils.

It has to be the 30 percent. If you put just a number of acres out there, it isn't going to work because there are guys out there that can put four cows to the acre and obtain that 30 percent.

But there are guys out there that don't have the right quality land to put four cows an acre out there, and they might not even get that kind of return on a cow to the acre.

If the farm's in the wrong place,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	they're going to have to size it to what they
2	have. I feel that's the only way that it
3	would be fair, and we have Lisa McCrory and
4	Sarah Flack, who have given you examples of
5	how they do it. Sarah said she'd be glad to
6	go help certifiers learn how to do it, and I'm
7	sure Lisa would too.
8	It's being done in the Northeast,
9	and it can be done any place else in the
10	country. Thank you.
11	MEMBER JAMES: I just want to
12	compliment you. Although we like to have
13	written submission, I'm just impressed you
14	always come up and you just speak without any
15	paper in front of you.
16	MR. SEGALLA: I can't read when I'm
17	nervous.
18	(Laughter.)
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Adam and Dave
20	Engel.
21	MR. EIDINGER: Good afternoon. My
22	name is Adam Eidinger. I'm the Washington

representative for the Organic Consumers
Association.

It's very nice to be here today, and I apologize that our group was not here earlier this week. We would have liked to have been, but we had some major scheduling problems.

Today, I'm going to present petition that is our comment on behalf of our It was signed by over 17,500 people members. on line. I have a CD-ROM here with a printout of petition and all the the names and addresses of everyone who's signed it, from all 50 states.

The petition reads as follows: "We, the undersigned organic consumers, are shocked and outraged that so-called organic factory farm feedlot dairies are importing milk calves from conventional farms and then raising these animals in crowded, inhumane conditions, with little or no access to pasture, and then labeling the milk and dairy products produced

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on these feed lots as `USDA Organic.'

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

"We call on the National Organic Program of the USDA to put an end to these practices immediately. We also ask the USDA to call on Congress to allocate adequate funds to help thousands of American farmers and ranchers make the transition to organic, so we can meet the nation's growing demand for organic foods, without lowering organic standards or importing billions of dollars in organic products unnecessarily from overseas."

realize the chair asked that we of the topics discussed comment some on earlier today. I don't have a comment everything, but I do want to mention just a couple of things that we've been concerned about, and were concerned about earlier this year.

This NOSB panel is -- can always call on the Organic Consumers Association to participate in any discussions you have at these meetings. We'd very much like to be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

part of the official discussion that takes place.

Consumer groups need to be part of the process, and I realize we're not industry players, but we are talking to consumers all the time and we're getting a lot of feedback from consumers.

Pasture is an important issue, contrary to much that was presented on the panel yesterday, and I got the report on that. This is an important issue. It can't be put aside. Antibiotics, that's an important issue too. We saw the survey.

But we're hearing that pasture is very important, and there are 17,500 plus people on this database who think it's important, and we want that to be emphasized.

We also don't think that industry consultants should be sitting on this board in the seats that are reserved for consumer or public interest groups. We'd very much like to see the vacancy that's currently open

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

filled with a true consumer representative. 1 2 I'm not saying that we haven't had -- all of the representatives haven't been from 3 consumer groups, but obviously we know about 4 5 the resignation that happened, which we were pleased by that. 6 7 So that's about it. As far as, I far of these sunsetted 8 quess, as as some 9 synthetics, you know, I'd be happy to try to position 10 our on them if 11 interested, but I did not come prepared to give the line by line answer on each one. 12 Do 13 you have any questions? CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. 14 15 MR. EIDINGER: Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dave Engel. On 17 deck, Lisa Engelbert. MR. ENGEL: Good afternoon. 18 My name I'm a certified organic dairy is David Engel. 19 20 farmer since 1988, and an organic 21 certification agency representative since

1989.

I have three things I'd like to cover, one to the board and then two to the NOP. To the board on the sunset materials, if I were you, I would tend to allow all sunset materials to come back on, unless very clearly, unambiguous, unequivocally, there are a unanimous effort to do it otherwise.

I really appreciated Andrea's common sense and reasonable approach to handling sunset materials. They've already been through a very rigorous process to get there to begin with, and you guys, I think, are doing a good job.

Then to the NOP, since it is my understanding that both the last third and the pasture issue are something that the NOP will be dealing with, rather than look in your direction I'm going to look this way and speak into the mike. But these are directed to you.

So these comments on organic livestock standards are addressed primarily to the NOP, as they are about access to pasture,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

which the NOP will be working on soon, and the last third, very simply, I think it needs to be.

If not, if the NOP is not inclined, then I would suggest that they consider commercial availability, the commercial availability mechanism in the last third issue.

So with all due respect to my fellow dairy farmers, many but not all of whom want stricter pasture standards, and with all due respect to my fellow certifiers, many but perhaps not all, of whom appear to feel inadequately empowered to enforce the current standards regarding pasture, I believe current pasture standards provide extremely adequate recourse and ability, empowerment if you will, to verify compliance of an organic livestock operator with ruminants, as regards access to pasture.

I'm going to emphasize some of these words continuously through here. A certifier

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

does not have to look for ducks, does not have to listen for ducks, and does not have to even talk with ducks to accomplish this verification of compliance.

The pasture standard states the producer of an organic livestock operation must establish and maintain livestock living conditions, including access to pasture for ruminants. "Must" means has to, is required to, very simple and legally significant.

Access means the ruminant is able to go somewhere, and pasture is where the critter goes. Means, according to the legal definition in the rule, land use for livestock grazing that is managed -- emphasis added -- to provide feed value and maintain or improve soil, water and vegetative resources.

Thus, when an organic inspector goes to a ruminant livestock farm, there must be access to pasture, based on those three words and what I just said. If there are ducks, they're great and hopefully the milk inspector

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

won't see them, or if he/she does, they won't be bothered by them.

However, if the organic inspector does not see access to pasture, then that will have to be documented, and the certifier will have to consider that documentation.

The current pasture standard provides the certifier with the ability to determine not only the compliance with access to pasture for a ruminants requirement, but also the ability to determine the amount of pasture needed in that operation.

The words in the pasture definition and remember, ruminants must have access to pasture, state that the pasture is land that is managed, and again I emphasize that word, to provide feed value and maintain or improve soil, water and vegetative resources.

"To manage" reflects and is management, the sum and substance of the organic system plan. George's comments this morning were extremely well-put. Just as one

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

manages many things on a farm, cow comfort, health, feeding and milking schedules and so on, on an ongoing basis, so too is pasture to be managed on an ongoing basis.

There will be situations where the amount of pasture is not enough, and this must be worked out between the certifier and the operator on a continuous improvement basis, just as many other management requirements and recommendations handled between are certifier operator; for example, and recordkeeping, machinery maintenance, buffers, facilities, crop rotations, organic compliance and so on.

In sum, large or small herds with or without sufficient pasture management in place are required to have sufficient management, pasture management in place, and all herd must be brought to that point on a continuous improvement basis, in reasonable and mutually-agreed upon time frame, that the certifier and operator determine via the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	organic system plan.
2	To paraphrase, and I have just one
3	line left.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: You can finish
5	your thought.
6	MR. ENGEL: To paraphrase a great
7	song sung by many great singers, Johnny Cash,
8	etcetera, Merle Haggard, "And if that ain't
9	access to country pasture, I'll kiss my"
LO	and I don't remember that last word in the
L1	song.
L2	(Laughter.)
L3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Dave.
L4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Dave, just a
L5	question. Thank you. I thought you were
L6	going to break into a song again like you did
L7	a few years ago, the whole thing. So then
L8	what's the problem right now? I mean, you
L9	know, we hear there's some loopholes that are
20	not being enforced by certain certifiers.
21	And as I mentioned yesterday, I mean
22	some people in the industry like yourself say

1	there is, you know, pasture is described and
2	it's there as it is. But then why are we
3	having the problems as we are, and why did we
4	have this wonderful symposium that we did?
5	MR. ENGEL: Well, I'll just address
6	the first part. The problems stem from the
7	certifier not interpreting the rule, and
8	working at applying it correctly.
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: Do you have any
10	specific spots, perhaps in the rule, that
11	certifiers are very good at
12	MR. ENGEL: No. I just, I read very
13	specifically. I quoted the words. Those words
14	that the certifier has to apply correctly, and
15	that will take care of scale, you know, all
16	herds, amount of pasture that they do or do
17	not have, a certifier can figure it out via
18	the farm plan.
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: I just think it
20	needs some more teeth, such as the exemption
21	for stage of production.
22	That seems to be what people think

is a loophole right now, and actually the term
access to pasture is kind of passive and
"shall graze" would give a more firm meaning,
wouldn't it?
MR. ENGEL: You know, I don't really
care. I mean my mother was an English major,
and she taught me to know all that stuff too.
But passive, active the words are there.
There is some legal teeth in at
least two of them. There's a definition
"must." Those two things have legal teeth in
them, and if a certifier can't handle it then
they just don't know ducks.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Dave, what state
are you from?
MR. ENGEL: Pardon?
MEMBER SMILLIE: What state do you
dairy in?
MR. ENGEL: Wisconsin.
MEMBER SMILLIE: Wisconsin.
CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Dave.
Lisa, and I think this last name, I'm having a

1	hard time reading it, Scott Williams, it could
2	from well.
3	MEMBER OSTIGUY: McManus?
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No. From USDA
5	Office of Budget and Program something.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: OMB?
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No. It's not OMB.
8	It's another okay. Lisa.
9	MS. ENGELBERT: Good afternoon. My
LO	name's Lisa Engelbert. I'm am co-
L1	administrator with NOFA New York certified
L2	organic in Binghamton, New York. I work
L3	primarily with the dairy farms in our
L4	organization. We're currently certifying 120
L5	dairy farms and we've got well, last count, 25
L6	more in transition. That seems to change
L7	every day.
L8	I'd like to first thank the NOSB and
L9	the NOP for the incredible amount of time that
20	you put into this program. I'm kind of seeing
21	firsthand how much that really is. Thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

(Laughter.)

1 MS. ENGELBERT:

Organic

certification is a privilege, not a right. It has to be earned. A producer that wants to get their farm certified organic needs to bring their operation into compliance with the rule, not try to get the rule changed or interpreted to fit their farm. We need to all remember that.

I would like to reiterate NOFA New York support for the proposed pasture policy, of a minimum of 120 days and 30 percent dry matter. I'm not going to beat it to death. We've all heard it. We all know what everyone said.

Public testimony has shown, excuse me, over the last two days that the vast majority of farms of all sizes all across the country agree that we need definitive pasture standards. We'll never reach 100 percent consensus on this or any other issue. But the majority of the farms in the country do agree with this.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

We agree with Jim Riddle's comments yesterday about conducting an inspection at the beginning of the one-year herd transition, to verify field status, feed on the farm, and animal health care practices.

We are currently doing that at NOFA

New York. We have -- we work with our

producers in transition for the entire year.

They apply at the beginning of transition.

They have an inspectoin and review at the beginning, within the first three or four months of transition, depending on weather situations, and then they have a second.

They update their information and they have a second inspection and review in about the last 90 days. So it works really well, and it identifies problems at the beginning, not at the end.

We fully support the last third of gestation, once the farm's made the transition to organic production and has become

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

certified.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It needs to be clarified that this is a one-time distinct whole herd conversion, and it is a one-time opportunity for conventional dairy farm to transition their herd to organic production.

It's clearly not the intent of the rule to allow a continual state of transition. Continual transition of animals for 12 months prior to producing organic milk will allow animals that have been treated with prohibited substance, fed GMO feed and slaughter byproducts.

We do see them in feed rations coming in, with these new dairies coming in, for the first half of their life, to enter the organic system. Think of what will happen if an organic cow tests positive for mad cow down the road. The implications could be huge.

I would like to comment on tetracycline and streptomycin in crop production. I should say I'm putting my

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

consumer hat on now, not certifier hat. We eat 90 to 95 percent organic food in our household. If we can find an organic, we buy it.

I think if organic consumers knew that antibiotics were being used on fruit or on crops, I think they'd likely change their buying habits. if substances like these continue to be allowed, what true incentive do growers and manufacturers have to develop effective alternatives.

Milk replacer. We agree with removing it from the national list. We had a Yoni situation on a farm, I think it was three years ago. We actually talked to the NOP, because they couldn't locate and we couldn't locate any non-BST (ph) milk replacer.

The NOP said "Well, because of the annotation, it can't be allowed," so we went back and said Sorry. They bought a pasteurizer. This is a bigger farm. This is the biggest farm we certified. This isn't a

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	little ten-cow dairy. This is a 350-cow
2	operation.
3	Pasteurized all of their milk, and
4	they have Yonis under control on their farm.
5	They're going a really good job.
6	Oxytocin, if this is kept on the
7	list, there needs to be clear annotation that
8	it has to be administered by a licensed vet.
9	I think there really is some abuse going on
10	with this product out in the field, the way
11	it's annotated right now.
12	Lastly, I would like to encourage
13	the NOP to start prosecuting and imposing
14	fines on farms found to be in willful
15	violation and subsequently revoked. A clear
16	message needs to be sent to the organic
17	community, that blatant, willful violations
18	will not be tolerated.
19	A five-year revocation is not
20	enough. Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.
22	MEMBER CAROE: Just a quick question

1	for you, Lisa. Do you require all of your
2	producers to participate in a transition
3	inspection, as well as their certification
4	inspection?
5	MS. ENGELBERT: We do. That's the
6	way we handle our transition program.
7	MEMBER CAROE: And what has the
8	accreditation folks said during your
9	accreditation visits, since that's not a
10	requirement of the
11	MS. ENGELBERT: They said that that
12	is not part of certification. That's our own
13	internal policy and it's fine. We're ISO-65
14	accredited. We're looked at every year.
15	MEMBER CAROE: Right, I know the ISO
16	65. But I mean I'm referring to the
17	accreditation under the program. So nobody's
18	had any problem with you hiring an extra
19	something beyond the regulation.
20	MS. ENGELBERT: Well, we don't feel
21	it's beyond the regulation, because we're
22	working with the producer for the entire year.

They're required to transition for a year, and we're verifying their practices at the beginning of the year, which I think should be required across the board.

MEMBER KARREMAN: On that, just --

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea was next.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay.

MEMBER JAMES: Thank you for your comments, and for your patience as you endure two second halves term. I'm just going to make kind of a statement, opinion, and then I wanted to ask you a question.

You know, some branches of protection have mottos such as to protect and to serve, and I know that certifiers are not officers, but I do believe that it is their job to reinforce the rules, make sure people are following the rules to inspect and ensure, and just like I asked Jim Riddle, I'm just perplexed at how some farms could be given an organic certificate if they're not following the organic regulations, and I wanted to ask

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	your opinion on that.
2	MS. ENGELBERT: I agree
3	wholeheartedly with you. I don't really
4	understand how that's happening. I agree with
5	Dave that the current rules should be enough.
6	I mean, the majority of the certifiers in the
7	country are doing it.
8	Unfortunately, obviously it's not
9	enough, because there are abuses occurring,
10	and I think because of those abuses, we do
11	need descriptive pasture standards,
12	unfortunately.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: Just a follow-up
15	to what Andrea was saying, or I should say
16	that I think PCO does the same thing NOFA New
17	York does. No? Leslie? Because I thought
18	there's like a pre-inspection, and I just want
19	to say it does really help the farmers.
20	It really kicks them into gear,
21	starting them thinking about things before it

is too late. So it is a very good thing. I

1	would agree with that, and I hope it gets
2	instituted.
3	MS. ENGELBERT: It allows any
4	potential non-compliances to be noticed right
5	up front, you know.
6	If you wait until the last four or
7	five or three or four months of transition to
8	do an inspection and look at their paper work
9	and look everything over and go on their farm,
10	if there's a major non-compliance there that
11	didn't show up prior to that, that farmer's
12	really in deep trouble. They've lost a lot of
13	yeah, I had to think about that word.
14	(Laughter.)
15	MS. ENGELBERT: I do live on a farm,
16	after all. But they may have lost, you know,
17	three quarters of a year at that point if you
18	don't do that, you know.
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: I've seen that
20	happen.
21	MS. ENGELBERT: Yeah. I've heard
22	horror stories about that happening. So

1	anyone else? Thank you very much.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. I'm
3	going to try it again. Scott Williams? Is
4	that from the USDA? If there is nobody
5	there, we will go on. David DeCou, and last,
6	Brian Baker.
7	MR. DeCOU: I'm speaking for Brian
8	Baker. He just blew away.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Then you are last.
10	Do you have a proxy then?
11	MR. DeCOU: Yes. I'm actually
12	quoting Brian Baker. Well, almost quoting
13	here. Dave DeCou from the Organic Materials
14	Review Institute.
15	Thank you guys for all that you do.
16	You've been thanked many times, but it won't
17	be enough. You know, I've been in the organic
18	industry for way too long, but not long
19	enough.
20	And, you know, the work you do, now
21	that I've stumbled into Armory over the years,
22	the work that you do is I know how

2 try to figure some of it out later too. 3 Brian put a question out to me about colors, because they talked 4 were about. 5 earlier, and he noted that one of you, and I don't remember who, mentioned that some colors 6 7 are both non-synthetic and non-agricultural. He was wondering if anybody could identify any 8 colors that are both non-synthetic and non-9 agricultural? 10 11 And I can't. You know, I think the point that colors pretty 12 is much are 13 agricultural, but --14 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Well, you're doing --15 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie? 16 17 MEMBER WEISMAN: It is not my area 18 expertise, contrary to Ι don't But I'm sorry. 19 colors. It's not -- colors are not my business, but I do know that some 20 colors are mineral, which would make them non-21 22 agricultural and non-synthetic.

complicated it is, because we end up having to

1	I think also some of the comments
2	that Tony Moore made about the non-
3	agricultural and non-synthetic ingredients in
4	flavors, non-synthetic.
5	He was specifically he was
6	talking about what we sometimes refer to as
7	natural aromatics or natural aroma chemicals.
8	We don't like to use the word "chemicals,"
9	but that is what they are.
10	I think that colors also include
11	those types colors, non-synthetic do
12	include those types of substances.
13	MR. DeCOU: As I said, it was a
14	question from Brian and I hope he hears what
15	you said.
16	MEMBER WEISMAN: I'll tell him.
17	MR. DeCOU: Brian also expressed a
18	concern that with the evidence that this
19	sunset process, a major significant part of it
20	is a concern about economic effect of any
21	possible change to the list.

to

point

wanted

Не

22

out

consideration that is not always brought up, but that a continued listing of colors in 605 is a dis-economic incentive for producers of organic crops that might be used for colors. So there's an economic effect in another direction that is often not remembered.

As a former organic farmer, I used to grow beets, and even in the early to mid-90's, I know some of them were dried and sold for coloring. Exactly how after they were dried, they left my purview and I don't really know.

Another point, and this is a personal statement, not from Armory but myself, but as a 20-year organic farmer, it always strikes me, and I just have to say this; I don't quite understand it. It always strikes me as surprising that the handling sector --

I guess the picture is an organic farmer does the best they can to produce the best food they can, the cleanest food they

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

can, in the manner they can.

It always strikes me as important that the handling sector and on through keeps it clean, doesn't add anything to it, and it always -- when I start hearing some of the terminology of flavors and other things, colors, I can't help but wonder, you know, it's not where we started.

I can't -- I don't know how to grapple with that. I understand how the industry has evolved, but I think we always need to take that perspective back, and how are we nurturing the whole system to keep it as what it originally was. It doesn't address any particular product, but it's one of those concerns.

I just get -- somehow it gets lost in the "making the industry grow" question, and I think that's one we shouldn't ever forget. You know, it all comes off the farms. Without the farms, there's nothing.

I've heard over and over again a

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

concern about antibiotics in crops. I've also heard people -- Julie mentioned aromatic chemicals, as if "uh-oh, I used the word `chemical.'"

This terminology -- both the terminology and the concept of what actually happens on the farm, the vast majority of the population doesn't know what goes on on farms, would be shocked about a lot of things that are regularly done on farms, that aren't really bad; they're just surprising.

I think it's a little scary to hear people trying to make decisions about what might be happening farm from that on а they don't really perspective, when know what's going Because they've been on. protected from the world of agriculture most of their lives, they won't understand why.

It's just very difficult as a former farmer, one with a bad back, that those kinds of thought processes might make a difference in how your decisions are made, because it's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	important decisions that affect a lot of
2	people. Thank you for all you do.
3	(Applause.)
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Dave.
5	I think there's a question, Dave, before you -
6	_
7	MEMBER JAMES: I appreciate your
8	comments. Can you please explain to me
9	I've not been a farmer how tetracycline and
10	streptomycin in crops is okay?
11	MR. DeCOU: I guess the question for
12	me is why is it not okay? At some point, it's
13	a very hard issue. There's a reason why that
14	there's no organic pears or essentially no
15	organic pears grown on the East Coast or the
16	Midwest, because of the climate.
17	So basically, you push everything to
18	an edge and you just push it off. If you
19	eliminate this tool, within a few years there
20	would probably be no organic pears, period.
21	That's acceptable or not.

I don't know how -- it's one of

those things that sulphur is a widely-used fungicide. It's pretty nasty stuff. It's not fun to use. I've used plenty of it in growing tree fruit for about seven years at one point.

You know, if you took it out to the consumer and showed it to them, they wouldn't want to ever know it was on their food. You know, I don't know what the damage to the system is of using it or not, and that's where it kind of gets really complicated, because as Miles was pointing out, in WSDA they're trying to go to --

Not in WSDA but in Washington, all fruit growers are going to a very integrated system, trying to minimize -- tweak their system so it protects itself, which -- instead of doing drastic interventions.

That's why they don't want to use tetracycline or whatever. But I don't know how you make that judgment. It's very, very difficult.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER JAMES: Has there do you
2	know of any long-term studies that have been
3	done to prove that those two applications are
4	safe?
5	MR. DeCOU: I don't know. I can use
6	the sarcastic comment "That's what you've been
7	eating for a long time." But that's a
8	sarcastic comment. But I don't have any I
9	don't know of any long-term scientific
10	studies, no.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur?
12	MR. NEAL: This is more of a comment
13	as you consider what you're going to do about
14	the streptomycin and the tetracycline.
15	There are three comments that you
16	have to consider. How does this substance
17	a previous board said that this meets the OFPA
18	criteria. Now we have to consider how does
19	this violate the OFPA criteria?
20	If we're saying this no longer is
21	consistent with organic principles and
22	practices, then that will be the case for the

next five years for any material that could resemble any type of activity those materials exhibit.

MR. DeCOU: If somebody petitioned

it, if it was removed, it would be off for five years. They couldn't be petitioned in the meantime?

MR. NEAL: What I'm saying is that if this board, through the sunset process, says that we're not going to renew it, there's got to be a justification.

Either it has some type of harmful impact on human health or the environment, it's not consistent with organic principles or practices, or there's some other issues related to the OFPA criteria.

That means that based on that decision, that material comes off the national list -- may come off the national list through rulemaking, and for somebody to petition otherwise, it's going to be hard for this board to say it now meets OFPA criteria, when

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	they sat it through this sunset process in
2	such a rapid fashion that it does not meet
3	OFPA criteria.
4	MR. DeCOU: I'd also like to point
5	out on the CDC comment about antibiotics to be
6	considered at this point.
7	I was struck by something that
8	Hugh made a comment about hydrated lime and
9	whether it was used or not, and nobody used
10	it, was sort of sense I got from what he said,
11	and he's obviously an expert in a certain
12	area.
13	It was quickly acknowledged that it
14	is widely used in there. When the CDC says
15	something, it's a question of how broad or
16	narrow your expertise is at times.
17	Are they really understanding how
18	it's being used in certain circumstances or
19	not? I don't really know.
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: Can I just answer
21	that, Dave. The list serve of 1,700 that
22	about 35 answered, I don't know how valid a

1	survey that is. But you know, that's how it
2	went. I won't get into the results again.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I think the
5	question of narrow perspective goes both ways.
6	MR. DeCOU: Oh, I understand that
7	fully, and I know. That's why you get the
8	hard decisions and I get to comment.
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Just in a closing
10	remark, I want to say that I highly respect
11	the work that your organization does, and
12	Organic Materials Review Institute, perhaps
13	the whole issue of antibiotics on crops is
14	something that you could look into, and I
15	would certainly appreciate that research.
16	MR. DeCOU: I would love to, but we
17	don't do that much research itself. I mean,
18	we research materials that come at us and not
19	ones that we don't have.
20	That's why we didn't comment on a
21	whole lot of things here, because it's not our
22	purview to make the decisions you have to make

1	or influence them, other than around
2	procedural technical issues, which is why we
3	spoke to only two materials.
4	So it's a little hard for us to
5	grapple with the plus funding, you know.
6	We're a not-for-profit. It means it doesn't
7	have extra money laying around. I would love
8	to look at things if we could, and Brian would
9	like to.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh, to wrap this
11	up.
12	MEMBER KARREMAN: I don't have your
13	generic list in front of me, but do you have
14	any of what you guys consider regulated
15	substances for fire blight on the Armory
16	generic list?
17	MR. DeCOU: I don't have that in my
18	head. I have a copy back there.
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: You had a copy or
20	two around here yesterday.
21	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Hugh, what's your
22	question?

1	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, I mean
2	Armory is wonderful for listing of ingredients
3	that are prohibited or not, and they also have
4	like a restricted category. So it's like
5	we're not sure what the NOP thinks about it.
6	But obviously it's been petitioned
7	to Armory to look at, and usually those
8	substances are, in my opinion from livestock,
9	they're fairly efficacious. Maybe not all the
10	science behind them, but they're in the
11	contention for, you know
12	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, they're in -
13	_
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh.
15	MR. DeCOU: Their job is just to
16	interpret the regulations.
17	MEMBER KARREMAN: Right. But
18	they're only brought materials to them, if
19	people want to pay the process to get them
20	reviewed, which is not cheap. So I was just
21	wondering if there's some
22	MR. DeCOU: Our restricted or

regulated category is not quite as you identified it. It is a category in which additional concerns have to be met before yo use it. Every pesticide that's on there, natural and they're all acceptable on the national list.

But they need to work with their certifier, and make them sure that they've already done all the management options prior to that, and they already know it isn't going to work and they have to use this tool.

They can't just use it as a first stop, and that's often what that "R" stands for, is you can't just step in, and I'm sure you have other things --

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yeah. I'm really going to have to cut this off.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Thank you. I can answer the question very quickly. Both of the materials are on the Armory list that were discussed as substitutes for tetracycline and streptomycin.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Nancy.
2	MS. FRANCES: Kevin? Over here,
3	Valerie Frances. There's a woman here that
4	did not make it on the sign-up list, and she
5	is requesting an opportunity to address the
6	board right now, if that would be permitted.
7	Bonnie Wideman? Wideman with NOSA.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Concerning
9	something that we
10	MS. WIDEMAN: Pasture?
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay, come on.
12	MS. FRANCES: Please spell your name
13	for the record?
14	MS. WIDEMAN: Wideman, W-I-D-E-M-A-
15	N. I'll make it very brief. My name is
16	Bonnie Wideman. I'm the Director of Midwest
17	Organic Services in Baroca, Wisconsin.
18	We are perhaps the largest dairy
19	certifier in the country, so I did feel that I
20	should make a comment, because other
21	certifiers have. We certify perhaps 350
22	dairies at this time, with maybe 50 more in

transition.

Though I do, would like to -- I wish the current pasture regulation were sufficient, but since it is not and since all cows are not receiving access to pasture under the current rule, I feel that we could verify 30 percent and 120 days, and that it may not be that our producers are meeting this now.

But if we have the flexibility to work with them, I think we can. I would also like to just register our opinion that since milk replacer is not allowable for Yonis, since ti's not an emergency, we see no use for it.

Also, it would be better if oxytocin were off the list, since most of our milk producers cannot use it because of their milk buyer. So that's it.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.

MS. FRANCES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. What we're going to do now is I know that when we took

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

our break at lunch at 2:00, the Handling Committee had an opportunity to meet and take care of some committee business, based on input from public comments.

The Livestock Committee, I believe, is set and ready for recommendations, again taking the input from public comment that we've had. But Gerald, the Crops Committee, do you need a few minutes?

MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. So what I'm going to suggest is what, 15 minutes or you tell me what works, because we did have time planned for this. We tried to squeeze it in there, but because there were people on both committees, it didn't work. So --

MEMBER DAVIS: If we are wanting to craft a change to the hydrated lime recommendation, that has to be physically typed up and --

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No, no, no. You can just do --

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER DAVIS: Ten minutes is
2	probably plenty.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Fine. So let's
4	take 15 minutes we'll give you. Then we'll
5	come back, take a break. When we come back,
6	we're going to start doing the recommendations
7	for sunset and other recommendations by
8	committees, and we'll be voting on those
9	action items. Thank you.
10	(Whereupon, a short recess was
11	taken.)
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I'd ask the board
13	members to be seated. We're all here?
14	(Pause.)
15	Board Vote on Committee Recommendations
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. We've been
17	able to have the Crops Committee breakaway,
18	and do some discussion at the committee level,
19	and we will start with we're going through
20	the recommendations for items that we'll be
21	voting on.
22	We'll do this by Committee, and

1	Gerald, we'll start with the Crops Committee.
2	MEMBER DAVIS: Okay. Find the
3	papers. The Crops Committee I guess we'll
4	bring up the materials one at a time. I've
5	got them all out of order again here somehow.
6	Excuse me. There we go.
7	Kevin, our intent now is just to re-
8	present the recommendation and ask for any
9	more discussion before vote. Yes. Just to
10	read
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: To read the
12	recommendation, and we've already had some
13	background information.
14	So I don't think you need to go into
15	that. Read the recommendation. We'll do one
16	at a time, and then we will enter that as a
17	motion, and then if it's seconded, we'll have
18	for Discussion. Yes Hugh?
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: When we're doing
20	this, if there was discussion at lunch in an
21	officially convened committee meeting, should
22	we say what we were in case

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: If you've changed
2	a recommendation based on committee work
3	today, then you would indicate what that
4	change was and then I would have a brief
5	discussion as to the rationale, as to why you
6	changed your recommendation from the earlier.
7	MEMBER KARREMAN: I understand. But
8	let's say there was also another discussion
9	no, okay.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No.
11	Crops Committee Recommendations
12	MEMBER DAVIS: Synthetic substances
13	allowed for use in organic production.
14	Section 205.601(a), as algicides,
15	disinfectants and sanitizers.
16	The Crops Committee recommendation,
17	based on comments received, is that for
18	chlorine materials, calcium hypochloride,
19	sodium hypochloride and chlorine dioxide, the
20	Crops Committee recommends renewal of these

use

in

this

materials

Discussion?

21

22

for

category.

1	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second. You needed
2	a second. I did it.
3	MEMBER DAVIS: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So it was moved
5	and seconded. Discussion?
6	(Pause.)
7	MEMBER JAMES: I only have one point
8	of discussion, and that is for the new
9	members, to be sure that you review on the
10	recommendation exactly how that committee is
11	recommending it, because I'm speaking from
12	experience.
13	But on my first meeting, it's
14	confusing sometimes whether you're voting yes
15	on a no or no on a yes. So you just want to
16	make sure that you look at that before you
17	make your vote.
18	MEMBER CAROE: Call the question.
19	MEMBER DAVIS: Call the question if
20	we're going to take the vote.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I'm trying to get
22	the paper work here. I'm sorry. We're a

little behind in getting the paper work. 1 So 2 this is 205.601(a). And the category is 3 MEMBER DAVIS: the Crops Committee recommends the renewal of 4 5 the following materials to the use category, Section 2, "Chlorine Materials," except that 6 7 residual chlorine materials in the water shall not exceed the maximum residual disinfectant 8 limit under the Safe Drinking Water Act. 9 one, calcium hypochloride; 10 Number 11 two, sodium hypochloride; three, chlorine dioxide. 12 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So if everybody's 13 clear, if you're voting "yes," it is to renew 14 these items. 15 A "no" would be not to renew them on 16 17 the list, and you have the option 18 abstaining, and just to point out that if you 19 abstain from a vote, it goes with 20 It's tallied in the majority. majority.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Okay. We'll start with Jeff.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Conflicts?

21

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you. Are
2	there any conflicts on the board with this
3	recommendation of materials?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Hearing
6	none, Jeff?
7	MEMBER MOYER: I vote yes.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: No.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
11	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
13	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
15	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
17	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
19	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
21	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?

1	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
3	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
5	votes yes.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: Rigo?
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I'm sorry, Rigo?
8	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I've got to
10	remember to go to the top of the list.
11	MEMBER CAROE: And the chair votes
12	yes?
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
14	votes yes.
15	MEMBER CAROE: 10-2-0-2.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Ten yes, two no,
17	two absent. So that motion passes.
18	MEMBER DAVIS: On the list, 205.601,
19	synthetic substances allowed for use in
20	organic crop production. Two, category of use,
21	(e) as insecticides, including acaracides (ph)
22	or mite control; (i) as plant disease control,

	norticultural oils.
2	The Crops Committee recommends the
3	renewal of the following material in these
4	categories of uses: (e) as insecticides,
5	including acaracides or mite control; (6)
6	oils, horticultural, narrow range oils as
7	dormant, suffocating and summer oils; (i) as
8	plant disease control, oils, horticultural,
9	narrow range oils as dormant, suffocating and
10	summer oils.
11	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: You entered that
13	as a form of a motion?
14	MEMBER DAVIS: Okay, yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Seconded. It's
16	been moved and seconded. Discussion?
17	(No response.)
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hearing no
19	discussion, we'll take the vote. Any
20	conflicts?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No conflicts.

1	Nancy?	
2		MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
3		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
4		MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
5		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
6		MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
7		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
8		MEMBER JAMES: No.
9		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
10		MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
11		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
12		MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
13		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
14		MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
15		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
16		MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
17		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
18		MEMBER KARREMAN: No.
19		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
20		MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
21		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
22		MEMBER MOYER: Yes.

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
2	votes yes.
3	MEMBER CAROE: 9-3-0-2.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nine yes, three
5	no, zero abstentions, two absent, and two-
6	thirds. We need eight to pass, so that motion
7	carries.
8	MEMBER DAVIS: The Crops Committee
9	reconvened before, a few minutes ago that is,
10	and reconsidered the topic of hydrated lime as
11	plant disease control.
12	We decided as a committee, voting 5
13	to 0, to change the recommendation as has been
14	posted to that the Crops Committee recommends
15	renewing the following material to the
16	national list:
17	(i) As plant disease control, Item
18	3, hydrated lime.
19	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
21	and seconded. Any Discussion? Any conflicts?
22	(No response.)

1		CHATRMAN	O'PELL:	Hearing	none
	T10	CHATRIMIN	O KELLI	ncaring	mone,
2	Julie?				
3		MEMBER WE	ISMAN:	Yes.	
4		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Joe?	
5		MEMBER SM	ILLIE:	Yes.	
6		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Bea?	
7		MEMBER JA	MES: Ye	S.	
8		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Andrea?	
9		MEMBER CA	ROE: Ye	s.	
10		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Gerald?	
11		MEMBER DA	VIS: Ye	s.	
12		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Dan?	
13		MEMBER GI	ACOMINI:	Yes.	
14		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Kevin?	
15		MEMBER EN	GELBERT:	Yes.	
16		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Hugh?	
17		MEMBER KA	RREMAN:	Yes.	
18		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Rigo?	
19		MEMBER DE	LGADO:	Yes.	
20		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Jeff?	
21		MEMBER MO	YER: Ye	s.	
22		CHAIRMAN	O'RELL:	Nancy?	

1	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
3	votes yes.
4	MEMBER CAROE: 12-0-0-2.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Twelve yes, zero
6	no, no abstentions, two absent. The motion
7	carries.
8	MEMBER DAVIS: I'm not sure of the
9	wording on how this goes, but concerning
10	hydrogen peroxide. The Crops Committee
11	recommends renewal of the following material
12	in this use category:
13	(a) as algicide, disinfectants and
14	sanitizers, including irrigation system
15	cleaners, for hydrogen peroxide. Section (i)
16	as plant disease control, Item 4, hydrogen
17	peroxide.
18	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
20	and seconded. Any Discussion?
21	(No response.)
22	MEMBER CAROE: Who seconded?

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy. Any
2	conflicts?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: We'll take the
5	vote, starting with Joe?
6	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
8	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
10	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
12	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
14	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
16	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
18	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
20	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
22	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
2	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
4	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
6	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
8	votes yes. 12-0-0-2. Motion carries.
9	MEMBER DAVIS: On the list, 205.601,
10	category of use Section (i) as plant disease
11	control. Streptomycin and tetracycline for
12	fire blight control in apples and pears.
13	The Crops Committee recommends
14	renewing the materials listed in Section (i)
15	as plant disease control, Item No. 10,
16	streptomycin for fire blight control in apples
17	and pears only. Item 11, tetracycline,
18	oxytetracycline calcium complex for fire
19	blight control only.
20	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second. I'm sorry,
21	is it both materials we're voting on?
22	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes. It's both

materials. Any discussion?

(No response.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER DAVIS: I did have a comment.

There's been a lot of debate both ways on these materials. People feel pretty strongly about it in general.

the Crops Committee discussed that in our meeting this afternoon, just a few minutes ago, and decided that upon listening to the testimony and then talking about the sunset process in general, that we should, even though we may have personal objections to the materials and the way they're used, but that we should stick to the strict intention sunset process and vote that way, of the rather than necessarily only on our philosophy or our personal feelings, but how obligated to abide by the rules and process of the sunset process. Anyone else have anything to add to that?

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No. I think that was well-said. I think that certainly my

1	sentiments are I would rather not be here, but
2	a previous board did go through the diligence
3	of approving that, and there wasn't anything
4	really brought forward, other than a
5	philosophical point, which I'd have to side
6	with.
7	But in the effort of the sunset
8	process, I would have to agree with your
9	comments.
10	MEMBER DAVIS: Barring any other
11	discussion, I can call the question.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hearing none, Bea?
15	MEMBER JAMES: No.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
17	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
19	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
21	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?

1	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
3	MEMBER KARREMAN: Abstain.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
5	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
7	MEMBER MOYER: No.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: No.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
11	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
13	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
15	votes yes.
16	MEMBER CAROE: 8 to 4 7 to 4-1-2.
17	It passes.
18	MEMBER JAMES: Sorry, I didn't hear
19	that.
20	MEMBER CAROE: Seven yeas, four
21	no's, one abstention, two absent. The motion
22	passes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So it passes.
2	MEMBER DAVIS: The Crops Committee
3	recommends the renewal of the following:
4	205.601, Section (j) as plant or soil
5	amendments.
6	Item 1, aquatic plant extracts other
7	than hydrolyzed. Extraction process is
8	limited to the use of potassium hydroxide or
9	sodium hydroxide. Solvent used is limited to
10	that amount necessary for extraction.
11	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
12 13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion?
13	and seconded. Is there any discussion?
13	and seconded. Is there any discussion?  (No response.)
13 14 15	and seconded. Is there any discussion?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?
13 14 15 16	and seconded. Is there any discussion?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?  (No response.)
13 14 15 16 17	and seconded. Is there any discussion?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start with Andrea.
13 14 15 16 17	and seconded. Is there any discussion?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start with Andrea.  MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and seconded. Is there any discussion?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?  (No response.)  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start with Andrea.  MEMBER CAROE: Yes.  CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
2	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
6	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
8	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
LO	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
L1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
L2	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
L3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
L4	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
L5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
L6	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
L7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
L8	votes yes.
L9	MEMBER CAROE: 12-0-0-2.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: 12-0-0 carries, 0-
21	2.
22	MEMBER DAVIS: For humic acids,

1	205.601(j) as planter soil amendments. The
2	Corps Committee recommends the renewal of the
3	following substances in this use category:
4	Item 3, humic acids, naturally occurring
5	deposits, water and alkali extracts only.
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
8	and seconded.
9	MEMBER CAROE: By Nancy.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
11	and seconded. Any discussion?
12	(No response.)
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start with Gerald?
16	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
18	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
20	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
22	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
2	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
4	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
8	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
10	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
12	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
14	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
16	votes yes.
17	MEMBER CAROE: 11-1-0-2.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: 11 yes, one no,
19	zero abstentions, two absent.
20	MEMBER DAVIS: Section 205.601,
21	synthetic substance allowed for use in organic
22	crop production. Category of use, Section (j)

as plant or soil amendments, Item 4, lignin sulfonate as a key leading agent, dust suppressant, floatation agent, and also as a flotation agent in post-harvest handling, Section (1), Item 1, lignin sulfonate.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved and seconded. Discussion? I have a question. If lignin sulfonate is available, and we talked before about sodium silicate doing the same function, is there a belief that we need two, or if we don't, which was it?

DAVIS: Based the MEMBER on testimony we received from the Washington being that state program, there is а limitation on the lignin sulfonate for some producers, on where they can for their waste water, the one to drop if you were going to drop one would be the lignin sulfonate.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: It was lignin sulfonate that we would drop, Because that's the one that would block --

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	(Simultaneous discussion.)
2	MEMBER SMILLIE: But only as a
3	flotation.
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Right.
5	MEMBER MOYER: The other material
6	was a dust suppressant as well, which is what
7	
8	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Right, right.
9	MEMBER SMILLIE: Right.
10	MEMBER MOYER: And the other
11	material doesn't do that.
12	MEMBER DAVIS: Can we split them,
13	that apart?
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I'm just wondering
15	if there's merit into limiting the use of it,
16	and not having it for oh yes. We can't do
17	annotations. This is right. Okay. All
18	right, I tried.
19	MEMBER GIACOMINI: So you can't use
20	hoist it on your own.
21	(Simultaneous discussion.)
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jim Riddle is

1	giving me the thumbs down.
2	(Laughter.)
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I learn from you,
4	Jim.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: That explains it.
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: We didn't say that.
7	He did.
8	MEMBER DAVIS: Can I call the
9	question?
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any other
11	discussion? Any conflicts?
12	(No response.)
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start the voting
14	with Dan.
15	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
17	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?  MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.

1	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
3	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
5	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
7	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
9	MEMBER JAMES: Abstain.
LO	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
L1	MEMBER CAROE: No.
L2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
L3	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
L4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair will
L5	abstain.
L6	MEMBER CAROE: 8-2-2-2. That just
L7	made it too.
L8	MEMBER DAVIS: 205.601, synthetic
L9	substances allowed for use in organic
20	production. Category of use (1) as floating
21	agents in post-harvest handling.
22	The Crops Committee recommends

1	renewing the following material to the use in
2	this category, as floating agents in post-
3	harvest handling, sodium silicate.
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
6	and seconded. Any discussion?
7	MEMBER KARREMAN: So would this
8	substance replicate one of the two functions
9	of lignin sulfonate that we just renewed?
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea.
11	MEMBER CAROE: Since lignin
12	sulfonate is not allowed for organic
13	production going over to Japan, it would not
14	solve the problem for those growers shipping
15	Organic product to Japan.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
17	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Additionally, it's
18	been disallowed in certain areas in the U.S.
19	in their sewer systems.
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: The lignin?
21	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes, the lignin.
22	MEMBER KARREMAN: But not the sodium
	f 1

1	silicate?
2	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Correct.
3	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe, did you have
5	
6	MEMBER SMILLIE: Same point.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Same point. Any
8	other Discussion?
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: Maybe the person
LO	from Washington state already talked about
L1	this, but would a grower be using both on one
L2	operation, or do they normally just pick one
L3	or the other, because
L4	MEMBER SMILLIE: It would depend how
L5	their water was treated, number one. If their
L6	water went to a municipal water system, they'd
L7	have to use the sodium silicate. But they
L8	could be using the lignin sulfonate for other
L9	uses, kelating agents or
20	But as far as flotation goes, it
21	depends on how their water is treated. If

they dispose of their own water, they could

1	choose between the two. But if it went into a
2	municipal water system, they have no choice
3	but to use sodium silicate.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Other discussion?
5	We have a motion that's been seconded. No
6	more Discussion. Any conflicts?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start with Kevin?
9	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
11	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
13	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
15	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
17	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
19	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
21	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?

1	MEMBER JAMES: Abstain.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
3	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
5	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
7	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes
9	yes.
10	MEMBER CAROE: 10-1-1-2.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The motion
12	carries.
13	MEMBER CAROE: Okay. I'll move the
14	mike closer. That was 10-1-1-2.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Are there any
16	others that you want us to read off?
17	PARTICIPANT: The one for lignin
18	sulfonate.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: 8-2-2. Eight
20	yes, two no, two abstentions, two absent.
21	MEMBER DAVIS: That concludes the

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Gerald.
2	Okay, Hugh.
3	Livestock Committee Recommendations
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay, Livestock.
5	The first item is 205.603, category of use
6	(c), as feed supplements. I forget. Do I say
7	what the committee okay.
8	The Committee recommended to not
9	renew milk replacers as listed.
LO	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
L1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So it's been moved
L2	and seconded. Discussion?
L3	MEMBER SMILLIE: That means if we
L4	vote "yes," we're voting not to renew it.
L5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The vote for "yes"
L6	is a vote not to renew the item. That's
L7	correct. Any discussion?
L8	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
L9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
20	MEMBER CAROE: I think when we make
21	recommendations to not renew, it should be
22	clearly stated which of the three criteria

1	were not met, because it's very clear in the
2	Federal Register that it's either human
3	health, wholly met what is it?
4	Non-synthetic alternative, or not
5	consistent with OFPA.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: I would say it's a
7	non-synthetic alternative is available would
8	be the reason.
9	MEMBER CAROE: And that's based on
10	testimony that
11	MEMBER KARREMAN: It's based on the
12	testimony of a few hundred people and farmers.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Any other
14	discussion? Any conflicts?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I've just got to
17	catch up with the paper work.
18	MEMBER KARREMAN: No problem.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The motion has
20	been made and seconded. The vote for yes is
21	not renew, so everybody's clear, starting with
22	Hugh?

1	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
3	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
5	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie.
9	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
13	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea.
15	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald.
17	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
19	MEMBER GIACOMINI: No.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
21	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes

1	yes.
2	MEMBER CAROE: 11-1-0-2.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Which means the
4	motion passes to remove milk replacers from
5	the list of synthetics.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: okay. The next
7	item is hydrated lime, and the Livestock
8	Committee had a meeting during lunch, and we
9	certainly have taken into account the public
10	opinion.
11	There was a motion to retain
12	hydrated lime on the list for livestock
13	production. That motion passed at the
14	committee meeting at lunch. So the official
15	vote now.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So the motion from
17	
18	MEMBER KARREMAN: The motion to
19	renew passed, to renew it. So the Livestock
20	Committee is renewing is recommending to
21	renew hydrated lime.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Was that a vote?

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's a motion.
2	MEMBER CAROE: We're not in
3	discussion yet. We need a second.
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I'll second.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been motioned
7	and seconded. Any discussion? Any conflicts?
8	(No response.)
9	MEMBER DAVIS: Is that a unanimous
LO	Committee vote at lunch?
L1	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes, it was. Yes.
L2	Shall I read the official listing then for
L3	the vote now? I didn't do that yet.
L4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The official?
L5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Well, the category
L6	use and all that.
L7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Sure.
L8	MEMBER KARREMAN: I should right?
L9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Put it in the form
20	of a motion, yes.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: So the Livestock
22	Committee recommends and makes a motion that

1	under 205.603, category use (b) as topical
2	treatment, external parasiticide or local
3	anesthetic as applicable, to renew lime,
4	hydrated as listed.
5	MEMBER DAVIS: Second.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Moved and
7	seconded. Discussion? Any conflicts?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start the voting
10	with Rigo?
11	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff.
13	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
15	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
17	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
19	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
21	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?

1	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
3	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
5	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
7	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
LO	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes
L1	yes.
L2	MEMBER CAROE: 12-0-0-2.
L3	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. The next
L4	item is 205.603, category use (a) as
L5	disinfectants, sanitizer and medical
L6	treatments as applicable. Chlorine materials,
L7	all three, the calcium hypochloride, calcium
L8	dioxide, sodium hypochloride. The Livestock
L9	Committee recommends to renew them on the
20	list.
21	MEMBER CAROE: Is there a second?
22	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Second.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Second, Kevin E.
2	Discussion? Any conflicts?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Start the voting
5	with Jeff.
6	MEMBER MOYER: I vote yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
8	MEMBER OSTIGUY: No.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
10	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
12	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
14	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
16	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
18	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
20	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
22	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
2	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes
4	yes.
5	MEMBER CAROE: There's one missing.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
7	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.
9	MEMBER CAROE: That's 11-1-0-2.
LO	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So the motion
L1	carries.
L2	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay, next item?
L3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes.
L4	MEMBER KARREMAN: The next item is
L4 L5	MEMBER KARREMAN: The next item is under 205.603, category use (a) as
L5	under 205.603, category use (a) as
L5 L6	under 205.603, category use (a) as disinfectants, sanitizer and medical
L5 L6 L7	under 205.603, category use (a) as disinfectants, sanitizer and medical treatments as applicable.
L5 L6 L7 L8	under 205.603, category use (a) as disinfectants, sanitizer and medical treatments as applicable.  The Livestock Committee recommends
L5 L6 L7 L8	under 205.603, category use (a) as disinfectants, sanitizer and medical treatments as applicable.  The Livestock Committee recommends renewing oxytocin as listed.

MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes. We did have 1 discussion about this at lunch, and I think 2 if 3 there was the consensus that it renewed now, that the annotation should change 4 5 at the minimum, so that it's only administered by a veterinarian. 6 7 MEMBER CAROE: So --KARREMAN: This is 8 MEMBER 9 discussion. We're not voting on an annotation I'm just saying that's what we were 10 11 talking about. MEMBER ENGELBERT: We did vote again 12 13 at the committee level. It did pass again. O'RELL: it. 14 CHAIRMAN And was unanimous at the committee level? 15 16 MEMBER KARREMAN: There was a motion to not renew it and that failed. Therefore, 17 18 the motion stands to renew it. We also had discussion that it should only be administered 19 20 by a veterinarian. At some point we need to But we can't do that here 21 take that up.

during sunset.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: But the intent of
2	the Livestock Committee is to take that up as
3	an issue?
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Absolutely.
5	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Part of our work
6	plan.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Part of the work
8	plan?
9	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
LO	MEMBER CAROE: Well then I would say
L1	we need a petition in order to do that. So it
L2	should be on the record and spread from here
L3	on out, that that's what we're looking for, is
L4	those folks that commented to petition for a
L5	change of annotation.
L6	MEMBER GIACOMINI: There was
L7	Discussion in the Committee, with a number of
L8	people who were not necessarily in favor of
L9	having it on the list, but not having the
20	justification within the three items that we
21	are specified to deal with, to justify taking

22

it off at this time.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Right, okay.
2	Further discussion? Any conflicts?
3	MEMBER KARREMAN: I guess I probably
4	make about \$200 a year off that product from
5	sales.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, it's
7	disclosure.
8	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. I don't
9	know if that's a conflict.
LO	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I wouldn't feel
L1	that you'd have to recuse yourself for I
L2	know your ethics are beyond \$200.
L3	(Laughter.)
L4	MEMBER SMILLIE: It's\$250, Hugh.
L5	MEMBER CAROE: You treat those
L6	animals, whether they stay in the organic herd
L7	or not, so I can't see that you're going to
L8	make any less money if this comes off the list
L9	than if it stays on the list. So I see that
20	as absolutely no conflict.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. That was a
22	better answer than the one I gave.

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
3	MEMBER OSTIGUY: No.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
5	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
7	MEMBER MOYER: Abstain.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
9	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
11	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
13	MEMBER DAVIS: Abstain.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan.
15	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
17	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
21	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?

1	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
3	votes yes.
4	MEMBER CAROE: 8-2-2, passes.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Okay. Last item
6	is 205.603, category use (a), as disinfectant,
7	sanitizer and medical treatments as
8	applicable. Number 13, parasiticides,
9	Ivermectin, as listed. The Committee
10	recommended to renew it.
11	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Second by Nancy.
13	Discussion? Was that what was the
14	Committee's was that unanimous from the
15	Committee?
16	MEMBER KARREMAN: We didn't discuss
17	it today, but on the Committee vote
18	previously, it was 5 yes and 1 no.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So it's the same
20	from our discussion before, that you had
21	expressed. Andrea?
22	MEMBER CAROE: Just any

1	reconsideration due to public comment? I mean
2	you didn't vote on it. You kept your original
3	recommendation. Was there any further
4	discussion?
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: no.
6	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Again, given the
7	parameters that we have to work within, we
8	couldn't come to a conclusion that, other than
9	what we did.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: For the sunset
11	process?
12	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Correct, given
13	the sunset process.
14	MEMBER CAROE: Is there any need to
15	ask commenters to petition for any changes? I
16	mean anything the Committee felt might have
17	been a preferable course of action if we had
18	it available to us?
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: This is still
20	whatever we if we renew it here, it will
21	still be considered by the regulators, due to
22	the antibiotic structure property on paper.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
2	MEMBER OSTIGUY: At least among some
3	of us, there is also the opinion that assuming
4	Moxidectin actually goes through, we would
5	like to request that a petition be submitted
6	to remove this from the list.
7	But based on the sunset criteria,
8	the recommendation was to put it forward.
9	MEMBER CAROE: Can I make just a
10	quick comment?
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes Andrea.
12	MEMBER CAROE: Just a reminder to
13	anybody that would petition to remove,
14	petitions to remove have priority to any
15	petition to add. So that would be I
16	hesitate to say, but a quicker process than
17	adding. Cautiously say it.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any further
19	discussion? Any conflict?
20	MEMBER KARREMAN: I saw even less of
21	this than I did the oxytocin.
22	(Laughter.)

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Hugh.
2	We'll start then with Julie.
3	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
5	MEMBER SMILLIE: Abstain.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
7	MEMBER JAMES: No.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea.
9	MEMBER CAROE: I'll abstain.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
11	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
13	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
15	MEMBER ENGELBERT: No.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
17	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
19	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
21	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?

1	MEMBER OSTIGUY: No.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes
3	no.
4	MEMBER CAROE: 7-3-2-2. The motion
5	passes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Six yes.
7	MEMBER CAROE: Six yes. I
8	apologize.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Two abstentions.
LO	The vote carries.
L1	MEMBER CAROE: No, it's not
L2	possible. It's 7-3-3-2. There's 14 members
L3	on this board.
L4	MEMBER GIACOMINI: It's only 12
L5	how many are here?
L6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Only 12 are voting.
L7	MEMBER CAROE: Twelve voting with
L8	two absent. There's 14 members on this board.
L9	It's 7-3-2-2.
20	MEMBER JAMES: The vote was 6-4.
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: We have four no's
22	over there.

1	(Simultaneous Discussion.)
2	MEMBER CAROE: I only had three
3	no's.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No, we have four
5	no's. We have four no's recorded. We have
6	six yes, four no's, two abstentions, two
7	absent.
8	MEMBER CAROE: Okay, so it passes.
9	6-4-2-2, passes. Abstentions go with the
LO	majority.
L1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Hugh.
L2	Handling. Julie.
L3	(Simultaneous discussion.)
L4	Handling Committee Recommendations
L5	(Pause.)
L6	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. The Handling
L7	Committee met during lunch, and voted to amend
L8	the existing recommendation for 205.605(a),
L9	non-synthetics allowed. The amendment, the
20	recommended amendment was to move colors from
21	renewal to the deferred category on this

22

recommendation.

1	The motion was made by Kevin,
2	seconded by Bea. The Committee vote to amend
3	was 5 yes, 0 no, no abstentions. It was
4	unanimous.
5	So a "yes" vote on this
6	recommendation will be to renew colors on
7	205.605(a), and to defer did I just say
8	colors?
9	To renew flavors, I'm sorry, on
10	205.605(a), and to defer colors. We've got to
11	vote on both at one time.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Or we could
13	MEMBER WEISMAN: In other words, we
14	amended the recommendation by moving colors
15	from
16	MEMBER ENGELBERT: We could put a
17	motion through, and I think it would be more
18	clear on this instance if we did that. So if
19	we took a separate motion for flavors first,
20	and then go to colors or however you want.
21	MEMBER WEISMAN: Sure.
22	MEMBER KARREMAN: I move that we

1	vote on the items separately, with flavors
2	first and then colors after that.
3	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay.
4	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, we don't
6	have the motion yet.
7	MEMBER CAROE: Well, he's motioning
8	to change
9	MEMBER GIACOMINI: He's motioning to
LO	split the vote.
L1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Oh. That's
L2	something the Committee the Committee can
L3	just make the determination on how they want
L4	to present it. That's fine.
L5	MEMBER WEISMAN: So do we need a
L6	motion right now.
L7	MEMBER CAROE: Which motion is being
L8	voted on? Which material?
L9	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. Right now,
20	the Committee is recommending that flavors,
21	non-synthetic sources only and must not be
22	produced using synthetic solvents and carrier

or any artificial preservative, be 1 systems 2 renewed on 205.605(a), non-synthetics allowed. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: OKAY. That is the 3 motion. 4 5 MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second. Nancy seconds it. 6 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: 7 So you have a motion to renew flavors under 205.605(a). Discussion? 8 9 MEMBER CAROE: I mean once again, is to complete the sunset process 10 this 11 this material. However, based on all of the comments received, we would welcome petitions 12 13 for specific flavor types, and potentially on different national list 14 listing them categories or sections. 15 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And I'm sure we're 16 going to get some. But that will trigger then 17 TAP reviews and we'll be able to go through 18 the process of determining how these stack up 19 20 to the OFPA criteria, as well as whether 21 they're agricultural or natural, for specific

groups. Hearing no Discussion, any conflicts?

1	MEMBER WEISMAN: Kevin, I am
2	involved in manufacturing both non-synthetic
3	flavors and organic flavors.
4	MEMBER CAROE: I would have to say
5	that I would suggest that Julie recuse herself
6	from this vote.
7	MEMBER WEISMAN: I recuse myself.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I think a recusal
9	on this would be accepted, yes. So Julie,
LO	I'll mark you as a recusal. Any further
L1	discussion, and any additional conflicts?
L2	MEMBER CAROE: Point of procedure.
L3	Can Julie make this motion if she's recused
L4	herself?
L5	MEMBER WEISMAN: Oh. This happened
L6	to me once before.
L7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No, no.
L8	MEMBER CAROE: I don't believe that
L9	she can.
20	MEMBER OSTIGUY: I will move that
21	the renewal of flavors, non-synthetic sources
22	only, and must not be produced using synthetic

1	solvents and carriers.
2	MEMBER CAROE: I'll second.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: For the renewal,
4	it's been moved and seconded by Andrea. Okay.
5	MEMBER CAROE: Sorry about that.
6	MEMBER WEISMAN: No. That's good.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any additional
8	discussion? Conflicts?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Joe?
11	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
13	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
15	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
17	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
19	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
21	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?

1	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
3	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
5	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy.
7	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes
9	yes.
10	MEMBER CAROE: 11-0-0-2, one
11	recusal.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So the motion
13	passes on flavors.
14	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. I am not
15	involved in the manufacture of colors.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. I'm glad we
17	got that up front.
18	MEMBER WEISMAN: So may I make a
19	motion?
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: You may.
21	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. I move that
22	we that colors, non-synthetic sources only,

be deferred from a decision on renewing on 205.605(a). I'm sorry. It's getting late.

MEMBER OSTIGUY: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy seconds. So

I think we probably want to explain some of
the Committee thinking, in terms of changing
this recommendation from renewal to a
deferral, and a large part of it is based on
public comment that happened over the last two
days.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Right, and I did mention some of it this morning, but I will certainly -- it bears repeating, that on this round of public comment, that happened after the decision to defer in August, we had a lot of comments opposing the relisting of colors.

Many of them cited the fact that they had not -- they weren't -- the fact that they're even on the list was not because of a recommendation from the NOSB, that in fact there had been recommendations to remove it by the NOSB that had not been acted upon.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	There's sufficient controversy
2	around its existence on the list now that we
3	felt that we could not recommend renewal at
4	this time, because of these procedural
5	irregularities. Is that fair?
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. The
7	procedural issues around colors, and hearing
8	from the historical perspective of not being
9	recommended by the board, and at one time the
10	board had recommended the removal of colors
11	and at one time and the technical correction
12	that didn't take place.
13	Certainly that leaves us in a
14	position that this will sunset unless there's
15	further action in October, but still runs the
16	risk of sunset at October 2007.
17	We would encourage the public to
18	file petitions for specific colors that are
19	being used, anado tumeric as a color if it's
20	not available.
21	If it's an agricultural component

not available organically, then

and

22

for

recommendation to 606. But this has got us in 1 2 a quandary, and right now we feel that the only thing we can do is defer it. 3 We might request a full 4 TAP on 5 colors as well, and that will be in the Handling Committee work plan, 6 do further 7 evaluation on this as to how we move forward. 8 Andrea? MEMBER CAROE: Well, also we would 9 request petitions for color types. 10 11 help us with our TAP reviews if we could have those. 12 Based on the comments heard, that we 13 categorize colors 14 could these into manufacturing techniques that would make the 15 TAP relevant to all the materials in that 16 17 group. 18 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur's been waiting in the deck. 19 20 MR. NEAL: And if a petition will be sent into the board for consideration of this 21

particular material, colors, we advise you to

please supply manufacturers information, so that the contractor can contact the manufacturer, to find out more about manufacturing processes, and that information will be kept confidential.

But that the contractor can provide the board with adequate information that Would resolve some of the questions that exist in the industry concerning color types.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I would just like some clarification from the Committee as to why they chose to defer and the time line, or what they envision happening, as opposed to voting and recommending for removal?

MEMBER CAROE: I can answer that. The deferral is because we don't have the complete TAP. We don't have any evidence to indicate it doesn't meet one of those three criteria for sunsetting the material.

But we don't have the information that was originally needed to put this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

material on the list and a board vote. 1 So 2 it's lack of information. There's not -- in order for us 3 recommend to allow this material to sunset, we 4 5 have to have -- define clear evidence that it doesn't meet one of those three requirements. 6 7 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the existing evaluation criteria that we did fill out for 8 colors left, has a lot of holes in it, and we 9 knew that. Jeff? 10 11 MEMBER MOYER: I just have a process questoin that sort of follows on to what maybe 12 13 Dan was asking. As a new person on the board, it's 14 my understanding that if no action is taken 15 16 today or at the next meeting, more than likely 17 material drops off list this the 18 automatically; is that correct? 19 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: That's true. Ιf no action is taken by the October meeting, 20 then this would fall off the list. October of 21 22 this year.

1	MEMBER MOYER: That's correct.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: `06, `07 for
3	sunset.
4	MEMBER MOYER: And the action that
5	needs to be taken would need to be taken by
6	the general public, in the form of a petition.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: For a petition for
8	specific colors that are in use today in
9	industry.
10	MEMBER MOYER: You could ask for a
11	full TAP report, and then bring this up for a
12	vote again at the October meeting.
13	MEMBER CAROE: We could ask for a
14	TAP report.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Go ahead. No, go
16	ahead.
17	MEMBER CAROE: We could ask for a
18	TAP report, but based on the comments that we
19	were receiving, the category in itself is
20	problematic. We need those public commenters
21	to petition for the types of colors that
22	they're using, so that we can have this listed

appropriately.

MEMBER MOYER: Then my question would be is there enough time between now and then for them to petition and have those petitions accepted so they would not have a lapse in color use? That was just a question. I don't know.

MEMBER CAROE: And we actually talked to the program about this, and they have suggested that they will handle this as expedited as possible in order for us to accomplish that. That was our concern as well.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Recognizing that there is an economic impact to people who are in the marketplace with those colors now.

But those people now who are using those colors need to get those petitions in, so that we can get the appropriate TAPs on not just the broad category of colors, but on the specific anado tumeric, carmine if somebody wants, whatever. I will recognize Kim if it's

appropriate.

MS. DIETZ: I think there could be some action on this board, and one would be to prepare the TAP contractors that there will be a TAP coming. They can start the TAP.

Also, you need to somehow seek the public to start petitioning, and perhaps that's through the trade association or something else. But somehow that communication needs to get out there on those colors.

You can request the TAP now. It just may take a little longer for them to finish it, because they won't have everything.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, and I think we'll have a discussion with this in committee, because I think just having a TAP on a general colors doesn't work. We're going to have to identify specific colors that are of interest out there, and start working in that direction, yes.

MS. DIETZ: We have done category

1	TAPs, but you still need specifics for the
2	ingredients. But generally, they're all going
3	to be made the same way and that sort of
4	thing, I would think.
5	MEMBER JAMES: This is a question
6	for Valerie. How quickly do you think we
7	could turn around and get this request posted?
8	MS. FRANCES: Request for a
9	petition?
10	MEMBER JAMES: Well, announcement,
11	request for public input on the
12	MS. FRANCES: Do you want to
13	recommend a format for that, or provide
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes, Arthur.
15	Defer to Arthur please.
16	MR. NEAL: It's all going to really
17	be based on how fast we can get information,
18	because our meeting concluded in November last
19	year, and we had TAPs ready, I guess, in
20	February of this year, for you all to review
21	for this meeting.
22	This is a different story with

colors, because it's such -- it covers so many different materials. The problem that the contractor had is that we don't -- we don't have any manufacturing processes.

So if there are particular colors that you know are of interest, we need to know what those colors are. We need to know the names of manufacturers so that the contractor can contact them, to give you proper information and proper perspective on what you're dealing with.

We can turn that around. This is what -- this is April. We can probably have it if we get the information, you know midmonth, by August.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And I see, I know we have representatives, OTA in the audience.

We have suppliers in the audience.

We have, I think, somebody representing GMA in the audience to get out words through trade associations, etcetera, that we're looking for this input. Yes, Rigo?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

MEMBER DELGADO: Just a question, and I'm concerned about getting the word out. I know there's a number of organizations represented here, but what other channels of communications do we have available to, you know, publish this request or this need of ours?

MEMBER WEISMAN: What occurs to me, we got a -- we had a comment on colors from the American Association of Colors -- there's a trade association of color manufacturers.

Ι don't think they had any representatives here at this meeting, and when they learn that colors has not been voted to renew at this meeting, I imagine they're going to get very busy. I don't know what the politics are of us informing them sooner rather than later that that's been outcome.

I don't know. Is that appropriate?

Can we call them, for someone on -- for me,

as the chair of the Handling Committee, to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	call them and inform them?
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, I think that
3	anybody who submitted comments we should
4	reply. So if somebody submitted a comment and
5	it's on record that they were in favor of
6	colors, I think that it would be fair to
7	notify them that colors are being deferred.
8	MEMBER WEISMAN: That's a good
9	suggestion.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So that at least
11	you've covered those people who have expressed
12	an interest, and then you have trade
13	associations. You have suppliers. I think
14	that's about all that I know to get the word
15	out. Yes Diane?
16	MS. GOODMAN: Very quick question.
17	MEMBER CAROE: Can you come up to
18	the microphone, Diane?
19	MS. GOODMAN: Diane Goodman. In my
20	role as co-chair of the OTA Committee on 606,
21	the OTA task force on 606. Can you give us a
22	date specific by when we would have to have

1	petitions submitted, so that they could meet
2	this deadline?
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: As soon as
4	possible.
5	MS. GOODMAN: Well, I understand.
6	But up until when? It really will help in the
7	communication if we tell people that it has to
8	be by June $1^{st}$ or it has to be by July $1^{st}$ .
9	Can you give us a date?
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Arthur?
11	MR. NEAL: Rough estimate I'd say
12	third week in May is the best drop dead date,
13	because there are approximately eight
14	petitions for substances waiting for October.
15	So we don't want to press them too
16	hard. These petitions have been waiting until
17	December, because of sunset. So if we get it
18	early enough to get it to the contractors,
19	they can put enough people on it.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. If there's
21	no further discussion, we'll take the vote.
22	This is a vote. The motion has been made.

1		MEMBER CAROE: Has it been seconded?
2		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes, for deferring
3	colors.	
4		MEMBER CAROE: Any conflicts?
5		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any conflicts?
6		(No response.)
7		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
8		MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
9		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea.
10		MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
11		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
12		MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
13		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
14		MEMBER GIACOMINI: No.
15		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
16		MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
17		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
18		MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
19		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
20		MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
21		CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
22		MEMBER MOYER: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
2	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
4	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
6	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes
8	yes.
9	MEMBER CAROE: What about Bea? Did
10	you vote?
11	MEMBER JAMES: He started with me.
12	MEMBER CAROE: Oh, I'm sorry. 11-1-
13	0-2.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Did you hear that
15	in the audience?
16	PARTICIPANT: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So colors, the
18	motion passed, will be deferred.
19	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. Moving right
20	along to 605(b). We had made a
21	recommendation, which we discussed earlier

1	This Handling we are make a
2	motion that we renew the following substances
3	in the use category, 205.605(b), chlorine
4	materials, disinfecting and sanitizing food
5	contact surfaces, except that residual
6	chlorine levels in the water shall not exceed
7	the maximum residual disinfectant limit under
8	the Safe Drinking Water Act.
9	Part of this recommendation also
10	includes not renewing lecithin-bleached.
11	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Is there a need to
13	do we need to separate this?
14	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
15	MEMBER KARREMAN: Why were they
16	bunched together?
17	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. Forget about
18	lecithin. We are recommending the renewal of
19	chlorine materials.
20	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
21	MEMBER CAROE: Nancy, you seconded?
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: All right. So

1	moved and seconded. Discussion? I think
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: Kevin, I do have a
3	question. I realize we already did it, but
4	it's only procedural. I don't recall seeing
5	this done before, where we voted separately on
6	items in one recommendation. Anybody have any
7	we have? Okay. I'm sorry. Okay, right.
8	Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Because we're
10	splitting when something not going to be
11	it's going to be deferred. So in order just
12	to
13	MEMBER WEISMAN: To have an
14	accurate, a fair and
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Not to be confused
16	for the voting and for the public, we could
17	take them as individual items. I think it's
18	the best to do at this point.
19	I know when we did the initial
20	rounds of these and we had the lots of them,
21	we put those through. But at this point, I
22	think we're doing the right thing.

And in terms of discussion, 1 2 once again going back to recognizing putting on the Handling Committee work plan 3 the previous chlorine recommendation for the 4 5 change of annotation that recommended back in 2003, I believe. 6 7 But I think we need to put that on the work plan and go back, because 8 terminology is 9 in the annotation still 10 confusing. It's not correct. But we're not 11 addressing this at sunset. But I do want this for the record to say we are going to look at 12 Any further discussion? Any conflicts? 13 14 (No response.) 15 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Do we have 16 motion that's been moved and seconded for 17 chlorine for renewal, starting with Andrea? 18 MEMBER CAROE: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald? 20 MEMBER DAVIS: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan? MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes. 22

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin.
2	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh.
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
6	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
8	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
10	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
12	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
14	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea.
16	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
18	votes yes.
19	MEMBER CAROE: 12-0-0-2.
20	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay, and now I
21	have a motion that lecithin-bleached not be
22	renewed on 205.605(a).

1	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
3	and seconded. Any discussion? This is
4	consistent with the Discussion from this
5	morning? Andrea?
6	MEMBER CAROE: Can you state the
7	specific reason for it?
8	MEMBER WEISMAN: Because there are
9	non-synthetic alternatives available.
10	MEMBER CAROE: Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Any further
12	discussion? Any conflicts?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hearing none, this
15	is a vote yes to not renew. Gerald?
16	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
18	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
20	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
22	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
2	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff?
4	MEMBER MOYER: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
6	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie?
8	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
10	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea.
12	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea.
14	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The chair votes
16	yes.
17	MEMBER CAROE: 12-0-0-2.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So the motion
19	carries and lecithin will be dropped form the
20	list.
21	MEMBER CAROE: Lecithin-bleached.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Lecithin-bleached.

	Thank you.
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. We're now
3	moving on to Section 606, 205.606, which is
4	non-organically produced agricultural products
5	allowed in ingredients in or on processed
6	products labeled as organic or made with
7	organic.
8	The Committee recommends the renewal
9	of lecithin-unbleached in this use category.
10	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's been moved
12	and seconded. Any discussion?
13	MEMBER KARREMAN: Didn't Lynr
14	Clarkson say that they make an organic version
15	of this?
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. Go ahead,
17	Joe.
18	MEMBER SMILLIE: They do, but
19	there's so many uses of lecithin throughout
20	the industry that at the current time, they
21	don't make as many lecithins that would fit

those uses.

1	So he couldn't nor could anyone else
2	say that they could provide a non-synthetic
3	alternative for all uses of lecithin in the
4	manufacturing processing sector.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: But that would
6	expand the incentive to have more of the
7	organic than he has, or they have, I should
8	say.
9	MEMBER SMILLIE: The incentive is
10	there.
11	MEMBER CAROE: It's still it's
12	606. There is still a commercial availability
13	requirement on this Section.
14	MEMBER KARREMAN: Right.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.
16	MEMBER MOYER: If I heard him right,
17	he did say that he had, what 120 out of 180 or
18	something already done. So they are moving in
19	the right direction I assume.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. He felt that
21	he could handle most of the needs that are in
22	the marketplace, but admittedly he said that

1	there may be some very specialized cases where
2	at this point he can't, and he felt with this,
3	the accompanying commercial availability
4	criteria for the ACAs, that that would go a
5	long towards improving organic lecithin usage
6	in the industry.
7	MEMBER MOYER: So he was supportive
8	of this.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: He was very
10	supportive of this, yes.
11	MEMBER MOYER: I just want to make
12	sure I got him right.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes. He in fact
14	stayed late just to make that comment last
15	night. Hearing no further Discussion, we'll
16	start the vote.
17	MEMBER CAROE: Conflicts?
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Conflicts?
19	Anybody have any conflicts with lecithin?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan.
22	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Kevin?
2	MEMBER ENGELBERT: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
4	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
6	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy?
8	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie.
10	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
12	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea.
14	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
16	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
18	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
20	votes yes.
21	MEMBER CAROE: 12-0-0-2.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The motion carries

1	retaining Lecithin on 606.
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: I have one more.
3	MEMBER OSTIGUY: Which one?
4	MEMBER WEISMAN: Commercial
5	availability. Commercial availability is
6	subsumed in the Handling Committee.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: A big one.
8	MEMBER WEISMAN: So can I just make
9	a motion, that we accept the recommendation
10	that was discussed this morning?
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yeah. I'd read
12	through the full recommendation.
13	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay.
14	MEMBER SMILLIE: You mean the whole
15	four pages?
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No. The
17	recommendation part.
18	MEMBER SMILLIE: The conclusion.
19	(Simultaneous Discussion.)
20	MEMBER MOYER: The conclusion.
21	MEMBER WEISMAN: The conclusion?
22	Okay.

2	MEMBER MOYER: Page three.
3	MEMBER WEISMAN: Oh, okay. Sorry,
4	okay. I get it. It's getting late. Sorry.
5	The recommendation of the Joint Handling and
6	Policy Development Committee for
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Do we have it up?
8	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yeah. Can we do
9	that?
LO	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Do we have it up,
L1	because it is lengthy? But so the public car
L2	see. This is the same as what was in what
L3	was posted. There were some changes, but
L4	Joint Handling and Policy Development
L5	<u>Committee</u>
L6	MEMBER WEISMAN: This document, this
L7	is what was posted on the website dated March
L8	30 <sup>th</sup> .
L9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. So it's the
20	
21	MEMBER WEISMAN: But mistakenly in
22	the books yesterday was a version that says

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No.

1	March 13 <sup>th</sup> , but that was replaced today.
2	Everyone got a copy of the final.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. So this is
4	the March 30 <sup>th</sup> posting recommendation.
5	MEMBER WEISMAN: That's the March
6	30 <sup>th</sup> up on there.
7	MEMBER CAROE: Which part did you
8	want up there? It is the part I just put
9	part of the recommendation.
10	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. We want
11	recommendation (a).
12	MEMBER CAROE: At the bottom?
13	MEMBER WEISMAN: Which is where you
14	are. No, no, no. You were in the right
15	place.
16	MEMBER CAROE: Okay. Here we go.
17	MEMBER WEISMAN: "The NOSB
18	recommends using the procedures currently in
19	place for petitioning materials onto 205.606,
20	meaning those currently in place for
21	petitioning in general also be used for

petitioning materials onto 205.606.

"The document entitled "Information to be included in a petition" that's shown on the NOP website, should be amended to include a description of the information needed for the determination of commercial availability of non-organically produced agricultural products.

"The following additions to this document are recommended:

"(1) We have to add the following bullet to Item A, which right now only gives a check off for allowed synthetics and prohibited non-synthetics. Agricultural (non-organic substance) allowed in or on processed product labeled as organic.

"(2) Add the following two bullets to Item (b)(12). When petitioning for the inclusion on the national list of non-organically produced agricultural products, the petition must state why the product should be permitted in the production or Handling of an organic product.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

"Specifically, the petition 1 must 2 include current industry information regarding history 3 availability of and of nonavailability of organic form of an the 4 5 product, and all factors that may present a challenge to a consistent organic supply. 6 7 Second bullet. "When petitioning for the removal from the national list of non-8 organically produced agricultural products, 9 the petition must state why the product should 10 11 be prohibited from use in a non-organic form. "Any information acquired since the 12 original petition to add the material to the 13 national list should be provided. 14 A is the recommendations that have 15 to do with what petitioners will provide. 16 refers to what the NOSB's role will then be. 17 18 "In recommending that an agricultural ingredient should be placed on 19 20 205.606, the National Organic Standards Board shall review the petitioner's claim that no 21

organic substitutes are commercially available

in the appropriate form, quality or quantity needed to fulfill an essential function in a system of organic handling.

Now C then refers "Once an item has been petitioned and recommended by the NOSB and is now on Section 606, it must be on 606.

This is then what the accredited certifying agents' role will be.

"The accredited certifying agent, in granting a determination that an agricultural ingredient 205.606 is not commercially on available in organic form shall (1)an Evaluate the applicant or certified operator's documented claim that no organic substitutes commercially available in the are form, quality or quantity needed by the operation to fulfill the required function, including test data demonstrating that organic forms of the ingredient do not the functional meet requirements for the form or quality necessary to the operation.

"Number two. Validate that the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

applicant has documentation 1 operator or 2 proving that the ingredient is not commercially available in an organic form, by 3 reviewing credible, available information 4 5 listing known sources of organic ingredients. "Number three. Notify the 6 7 certification applicant or certified operator of sources of information which list available 8 organic ingredients." 9 I'd like to clarify here that it is 10 11 not asking the certifier to list for the of the ingredient; 12 applicant sources sources of information which list ingredients. 13 "If the certifying agent finds that 14 such ingredients exist, or maintain and submit 15 16 to the National Organic Program annually an up-to-date list of ingredients that have been 17 18 granted allowances in non-organic form. "The list shall maintain the 19 confidentiality of ingredient suppliers 20 21 parties granted allowances. The reporting

requirements shall be implemented through the

1	accreditation process by providing ACAs ample
2	notification and time to adapt data management
3	systems.
4	"Five. Require certified operators
5	to update commercial availability information
6	in each organic system plan update. That
7	means annually.
8	"Number six. Acknowledge all
9	complaints concerning allowances granted, and
10	provide rationale for determinations. If the
11	investigation of a complaint provides
12	significant new information, then the
12 13	significant new information, then the certifying agent must revisit the allowance."
13	certifying agent must revisit the allowance."
13 14	certifying agent must revisit the allowance."  I'm not sure why that "and" is
13 14 15	certifying agent must revisit the allowance."  I'm not sure why that "and" is there. I think that's a typo.
13 14 15 16	certifying agent must revisit the allowance."  I'm not sure why that "and" is there. I think that's a typo.  MEMBER CAROE: And is that the
13 14 15 16 17	certifying agent must revisit the allowance."  I'm not sure why that "and" is there. I think that's a typo.  MEMBER CAROE: And is that the motion, Julie?
13 14 15 16 17	certifying agent must revisit the allowance."  I'm not sure why that "and" is there. I think that's a typo.  MEMBER CAROE: And is that the motion, Julie?  MEMBER WEISMAN: And that's the
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	certifying agent must revisit the allowance."  I'm not sure why that "and" is there. I think that's a typo.  MEMBER CAROE: And is that the motion, Julie?  MEMBER WEISMAN: And that's the motion.

	and seconded. Discussion. Andrea.
2	MEMBER CAROE: I just want to make
3	note that based on comments received and I
4	think it should be very clear that the policy
5	work plan should include working in
6	collaboration with the program on the document
7	that is "Information for a Petition to Add
8	Detail to that Document."
9	Secondly, that perhaps the Handling
10	Committee work plan in collaboration with the
11	program, should develop the evaluation forms
12	that will be used by the board in evaluating
13	606 petition materials.
14	MEMBER JAMES: That would go on the
15	work plan.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jeff.
17	MEMBER MOYER: I have a question for
18	the Handling Committee and how they addressed
19	the concern that came up today regarding the
20	number of sources that are contacted in
21	Section (c)(2).

MEMBER SMILLIE: Again, it's a good

point and it can be worked on. Remember, we've got -- this is the general recommendation, and it can be fine-tuned and detail can be added.

One of the things I was going to add, that the Committee also would work with the NOP during their presentation to the ACAs, of how this is going to be implemented and things like that could be.

Specifically about the three, it's a good number and it's a good general reference.

But you know, we had a couple of submissions.

One was entitled "Gaming the Commercial Availability Rule." There are many ways, you know, the flexibility that's allowed certification agents can be played with.

What we're trying to do is put a general recommendation forward to end that, and to really put a consistent level playing field into how certification agents deal with commercial availability.

My feeling is this is a good start,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

but details can be added. It's not written in stone, and I think that really where the rubber hits the road on this is the two forms that Andrea talked about, but also how the NOP will roll this out in a training to the ACAs.

MEMBER CAROE: Thanks, Joe. I edited everybody else's work plan except my own. I wonder how that happened?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes.

MEMBER GIACOMINI: I have to admit I'm totally not up to speed on this issue, and it creates a lot of confusion for me. I do have one question. Are we saying that in order to implement the commercial availability and the three alternative issues that something has to be on 606?

MEMBER WEISMAN: That actually is the result of ruling. а court That's something that occurred outside of the of this activities board. So what we're implement criteria trying to is do and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	procedures, so that the whole organic world
2	can comply with the court order.
3	MEMBER GIACOMINI: So in the
4	situations that I've experienced this kind of
5	a situation, if someone's in a particular
6	microclimate and needs 72-day corn, and they
7	look and it's not available, corn seed would
8	have to be on 606? I mean what is 606?
9	MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, 606 only
10	refers to handling. Seed is a crops issue.
11	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Okay, thank you.
12	That clarifies it. Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes Andrea.
14	MEMBER CAROE: Just, you know, the
15	background section of this I think clearly
16	explains that commercial availability has been
17	part of this regulation since the day it was
18	implemented.
19	But the interpretation on how that
20	is implemented drastically changed, and was
21	refocused based on the court ruling. So this
22	is the start of implementing those necessary

1	changes, based on the court ruling.
2	If you take an opportunity to read
3	the background, hopefully that will explain it
4	if you have further questions.
5	MEMBER GIACOMINI: One of the things
6	I while having read the rule, I certainly
7	have not memorized all the numbers yet.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie, I know
9	there was some public comment given, in terms
10	of some people thinking that there should be
11	additional information put on Section B.
12	Maybe you'd like to address that and what some
13	of the Committee thoughts were along that
14	line.
15	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. Well, that
16	was actually that was a reference to an
17	earlier draft, an even earlier draft of this,
18	the many earlier drafts of this
19	recommendation.
20	Section B, what the NOSB would be
21	doing, was laid out in with separate

numbered sections for the NOSB considering

form, considering functionality. Also, the language of it in the earlier draft was that we would evaluate during the petitioning process those claims.

The feeling of the Committee was that we would not be in a position to evaluate all the many manufacturers that might use an item for many different functions, that that has something that historically has been done by the certifiers on a case-by-case basis.

It should continue to be done that way, while recognizing that we needed to continue to work on how certifiers were going to have more guidance as to how to tighten up and make the process more rigorous concerning allowances for non-organic agricultural products.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So if a person petitions an item through this process and gets it on 606, ultimately they're going to be accountable for the ACA criteria that is in Part C.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MEMBER CAROE: And they'll be held
2	by their certifier to the requirements under
3	С.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Right. Rigo?
5	MEMBER DELGADO: One of the concerns
6	as well was to make sure that the applicant
7	knew exactly what is it that ACA was going to
8	request on that.
9	MEMBER CAROE: What the ACA was
LO	going to request, or the petition?
L1	MEMBER DELGADO: Or the petition.
L2	MEMBER CAROE: And that's why adding
L3	to the work plan for policy, to work with the
L4	program and revise the information for
L5	petition document.
L6	Because right now, the
L7	recommendation that we've made is consistent
L8	with the language in the document now, knowing
L9	that further detail needs to be put in not
20	only for List 606, but for 601, 602, 603.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So the petition,
2.2	the current petition process is going to

1	undergo a change, with listing of additional
2	criteria on the petition process itself, and
3	this will go in conjunction with that.
4	MEMBER ENGELBERT: One quick
5	question for the Committee. Who will
6	determine essential function in Part B?
7	That's the only gray area that I see, that I'm
8	concerned about.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Well, maybe Joe,
10	as a certifier, you might want to go through
11	the answer to Kevin's question, in terms of
12	how you would approach the function?
13	MEMBER ENGELBERT: An essential
14	function.
15	MEMBER SMILLIE: Of the material?
16	Could you just repeat it Kevin?
17	MEMBER ENGELBERT: The last sentence
18	in B about yes. Who needed to fulfill an
19	essential function and is that just a given,
20	or is that something that needs to be
21	determined at the time this material is
22	petitioned?

MEMBER SMILLIE: Well again, if it's 1 2 B Section, that's something the NOSB has to The C section is what the accredited 3 do. certification agent has to do. 4 5 MEMBER ENGELBERT: Okay. MEMBER SMILLIE: So that will be an 6 7 NOSB rule to determine. we will be 8 MEMBER WEISMAN: But doing that on the basis of information that's 9 been included in the petitions. 10 11 For instance, some information that would be included by a petitioner would be 12 that they have already had allowances from 13 their certifier, to use the non-organic form 14 of this product based on that nothing was 15 commercially available to 16 fulfill 17 question. 18 That's one of the types of information that we will have available to us 19 20 when we are making this determination. We

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

would want to see, at the very least, that

there's a history that is verified already by

21

ACA.

MEMBER ENGELBERT: Okay.

MEMBER DELGADO: But again, we would need as board members some sort of template, if you will, or a list of criteria that includes, yes, not only that it passed the certifier's point of view, but also look into specific areas like what Kevin was pointing out. We need to define those.

I think that's why the importance of defining, or the work that Andrea was pointing out, comes into play. We need those specific elements that will standardize.

MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, can I make -I will suggest that we're going to -- after we
finish voting on this item, we're going to be
talking about our work plans, and that it
would probably --

It would be appropriate if the Handling Committee, possibly in conjunction with the Policy Development Committee, add to the work plan the development of any changes

additions to the evaluation 1 current or 2 criteria checklist that we have, to make it appropriate for this purpose. 3 Ι just MEMBER JAMES: want to 5 clarify that this recommendation will evolve over time, as more input and more information 6 7 comes back to us about things that need to be

clarified, things that need to be further

defined, and that by putting it on the work

plan is part of that process.

8

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I will recognize Kim quickly.

MS. DIETZ: I just want to go on the record that you're going to have a lot of petitions coming in. So even though this could be an evolving work plan and we could redefine it, that it doesn't stop the process of those petitions being received reviewed.

If you guys aren't ready for them they're coming in, they need through, because within a year, they're going

to -- they need to be on the national list.

So you know, as long as you can keep working on it. But it doesn't stop a petition for being incomplete, or you don't have the criteria together. You guys need to start working on these. This is the other train wreck.

You know, we had the sunset and now we have 606. I would also encourage the board to get the rest of the group up to speed on 606, because there potentially could be hundreds of materials out there coming your way.

MEMBER JAMES: Kim, I agree with you 100 percent. I don't think that there's any way that this document could be further and further and further crafted, to not evolve once the petitions come in, because the petitions are going to be basically information for us, on how it needs to be further defined.

MS. DIETZ: Right, and it's going to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	be you're kind of learning as you go. But you
2	have a foundation, but as long as it doesn't
3	stop the process, because you will have to
4	develop that criteria.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No. I truly view
6	this as a foundation that we need to build
7	upon. I think we're going to learn from this
8	that
9	MEMBER OSTIGUY: It's a living
10	thing.
11	MS. DIETZ: Well, but in the past
12	I'll just tell you from past chair experience,
13	if a petition isn't complete, it stops with
14	them. If they don't have the information that
15	you want, then it's not going to go the board,
16	and then you're going to bog the system down.
17	If you don't have your criteria set,
18	you're not going to be able to vote on it. So
19	it is pretty important to get that stuff
20	figured out before you start reviewing
21	materials, and they're coming.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. FRANCES: Valerie Francis.

22

I'm

1	going to do my best to work with this process,
2	to make sure things don't become a train
3	wreck. So you haven't had me before, so I
4	hope I can be helpful.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Thank you,
6	Valerie. All right. I think we're ready to
7	vote. We're voting on the recommendation of
8	commercial availability, to set the
9	recommendation. Hugh?
10	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo?
12	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Nancy, before she
14	left hearing the discussion, left a "yes" for
15	me with a proxy. Julie?
16	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe?
18	MEMBER SMILLIE: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Bea?
20	MEMBER JAMES: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Andrea?
22	MEMBER CAROE: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Gerald?
2	MEMBER DAVIS: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Dan?
4	MEMBER GIACOMINI: Abstain.
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the chair
6	votes yes.
7	MEMBER CAROE: 11-0-1-2.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. That
9	concludes the work and action items for the
10	Committee. The last thing on the agenda was
11	to present Committee work plans. You take
12	five? Asking for five. Okay.
13	I'll take five, but five, so we can
14	get back and just wrap up with the Committee
15	work. Andrea, did you say you wanted to
16	start?
17	Presentation of Committee Work Plans
18	MEMBER CAROE: If you don't mind.
19	It's very short. The CAC has three items on
20	work plan. Outstanding item is to collaborate
21	with the NOP on a peer review procedure for
22	the continuation of a peer review at the

1	program level.
2	The second item is to collaborate
3	with the NOP again on response items to the
4	previous peer review through ANSI.
5	The third item is once again to
6	collaborate with the NOP on ACA training,
7	specifically in regards to application of
8	commercial availability.
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Any
10	questions of Andrea? The one thing I would
11	ask is that all of the committee chairs, let's
12	point out who in your committee is the vice
13	chair.
14	MEMBER CAROE: Vice chair for our
15	committee is Joe Smillie.
16	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Joe Smillie. We
17	want to get this on the record, so Joe Smillie
18	is vice chair. Who's next? Who wants to go?
19	MEMBER KARREMAN: I'll go.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Hugh?
21	MEMBER KARREMAN: Actually, this is
22	for Livestock and I am the vice chair but

acting chair, so I'm both. But no.

Technically I'm vice chair, just for the record, and Mike Lacy is chair.

I talked to him on When Monday before coming up here, basically two things that he mentioned were to work on the last third of gestation the livestock or replacement clause, because of things that are happening after June 9<sup>th</sup>. That's the first thing.

The other thing is to, now that we've received the aquiculture report, to you know, consider that and work on that.

Okay. In terms of the aquiculture - what did I say? Aquiculture. Yes. In
terms of the aquiculture report, George
Lockwood is expecting Mike Lacy to contact
him, to have a discussion, so that they can
get on the same page in terms of further
direction, what plans can be done internally.

Since that working group has not been disbanded, what other things they might

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	be able to help out and what is the time line
2	and continuation of the shellfish part of that
3	recommendation that needs to come in a report
4	form. Yes Andrea?
5	MEMBER CAROE: George approached me,
6	and asked the board to consider an ad hoc
7	group to deal with aquiculture, since it's not
8	a direct fit with livestock. It's been stuck
9	with livestock because it's a better fit than
10	any other committee.
11	But perhaps an ad hoc committee,
12	where maybe there's a variety of different
13	talents to that group.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So you want an ad
15	hoc committee composed of, within our board?
16	MEMBER CAROE: Of committee members
17	board members, yes.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay, okay. Maybe
19	Mike can discuss that.
20	MEMBER JAMES: Maybe some kind of
21	Joint Committee?
22	MEMBER CAROE: Not necessarily a

joint committee. Just an ad hoc committee.

It could be members from any one of the different committees.

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: There are some other people on the board that have an interest in being involved in that activity.

Okay.

MEMBER KARREMAN: These aren't necessarily in the order that, you know, they're just on the work plan. Also of course keep dealing with the pasture issue with the NOP. Keep going back and forth with them, work with them as we can from our symposium here.

Then I think from the public comments and what we said right before the votes today, I think on the work plan would be to -- and we could do this from within the NOSB I guess, change the annotations on oxytocin and perhaps Ivermectin. I'm not certain on that.

But there are two materials that we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	need because of the votes and public
2	comment, we need to kind of keep on the
3	burner.
4	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.
5	MEMBER JAMES: I have a question.
6	Can I ask you something Hugh?
7	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yes.
8	MEMBER JAMES: There was a comment
9	that there's an organic system plan for
10	livestock, as far as dairy operations and
11	pasture. I was wondering if you guys were
12	going to look into that and see if that
13	outline Jim, you had mentioned something
14	about that, and if
15	MEMBER KARREMAN: What George had
16	mentioned as the farm system, the old farm
17	plan? He wants that reemphasized? No? Go
18	ahead.
19	MR. RIDDLE: Yes. Jim Riddle.
20	Yeah, ATRA has been commissioned by NOP to
21	work on system plans, and has the livestock

plan template. It's not just for dairy or

1	pasture, but it includes those.
2	So yes, I think that would be good
3	for the Livestock Committee, to be ready to
4	review that, because my understanding of it,
5	George Kipper will soon be submitting it.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yeah, great. So
7	we will be looking at ATRA checklist.
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Good. Thank you.
9	Rigo?
10	MEMBER DELGADO: The PDC has four
11	items on the table. The first one is to make
12	sure that we finish finally the new guide, the
13	guide for new members, 101. The second one is
14	elements that we've been working on since our
15	last meeting.
16	The second point includes revision
17	of the board policy manual, specifically
18	concentrating on the clarification of
19	deferral.
20	The third item will be review
21	potentially separation of mineral source
22	supplements from ag source supplements.

1	The final one is work together with
2	Crops Committee to define the temporary
3	variances for research. Bea is my vice chair.
4	MEMBER JAMES: There's pain in us
5	all.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. For the
7	record, Bea is the vice chair.
8	MEMBER DELGADO: Yes, and I also
9	should mention that I'm going to be working
10	closely with NOP, to make sure we come up with
11	a nice new guide that is suitable for
12	everyone.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: New guidelines?
14	MEMBER JAMES: The new member guide.
15	MEMBER DELGADO: No, the new member
16	guide.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The new member
18	guidelines. Okay, thank you.
19	MEMBER CAROE: What was the third
20	item, Rigo? Mineral supplements?
21	MEMBER DELGADO: Yeah. Review
22	potential separation of mineral source

1	supplements from ag source supplements.
2	MEMBER JAMES: I also just want to
3	clarify that the policy and procedure manual
4	is actually under the leadership of the vice
5	chair.
6	So that as we go forward with the
7	notes on things that need to be changed in the
8	policy and procedure manual, that the Policy
9	Committee will be working with Andrea on that.
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Rigo, going back
11	to that separation, I'm confused.
12	MEMBER DELGADO: Me too.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.
14	MEMBER DELGADO: Let me as I
15	said, I inherited these points from the
16	previous chair.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Who was?
18	MEMBER DELGADO: Who was Dave
19	Carter.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And I just saw
21	Dave leave the room. He knew you were going

1	(Laughter.)
2	MEMBER SMILLIE: He had his own
3	distractions.
4	MEMBER DELGADO: If you remember, we
5	managed to clarify what Point 4 was, temporary
6	variances. But let me have that as my
7	assignment, and I promise
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Contact Dave and
9	find out what his intent was.
LO	MEMBER DELGADO: I'll find out the
L1	details.
L2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Because I don't
L3	understand it.
L4	MEMBER DELGADO: I apologize for
L5	that.
L6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Do you Jim?
L7	MR. RIDDLE: No.
L8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. Then I
L9	don't feel so bad.
20	MEMBER DELGADO: But I think I do.
21	(Laughter.)
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: All right, thank

1	you, Rigo. Tried to slide it by. You felt
2	his voice lowered, but it was a
3	(Laughter; simultaneous Discussion.)
4	MEMBER CAROE: Shall we move along?
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Handling
6	Committee, moving on. Yes, go.
7	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay, all right.
8	I've got to say I was really looking forward
9	to just crossing sunset materials off the
10	list, but we do have one deferral. So we will
11	be requesting a TAP on colors and seeking
12	petitions on specific colors. We'll still be
13	doing that.
14	Next on our work plan is to continue
15	to work on the ag/non-ag question, in
16	conjunction as a joint venture with the
17	full Materials Committee, especially in light
18	of the new request for consideration of yeast
19	as either livestock or non-plant life.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Non-plant life, a
21	part of its definition of livestock.
22	MEMBER WEISMAN: All right.

1	Pasture, no. We will also actually Bea had
2	prepared, although it didn't get attached, a
3	very detailed step-by-step plan, including a
4	time line, for how we are now going to
5	incorporate into a revised recommendation on
6	synthetic versus non-synthetic, a definition
7	of synthetic that incorporates all of the
8	wonderful feedback we got from the program, as
9	well as some other public comments that were
10	very thorough and insightful. We will also be
11	working on that jointly with the Materials
12	Committee.
13	We will continue to participate in
14	the Pet Food Task Force work, which I
15	participate in, and I can continue to do that
16	until such point that it becomes an item that
17	the full committee will need to consider.
18	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And your vice
19	chair?
20	MEMBER WEISMAN: I don't have a vice
21	chair.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Because it's

1	important, because the vice chairs of the
2	Handling Committee and the Livestock Committee
3	and the Crops Committee will be the liaison on
4	the Materials Committee for petition review.
5	MEMBER WEISMAN: Right.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So we need to
7	if you don't have one now, you need to
8	maybe in the first committee meeting that we
9	have, we need to get one and have it on
10	record, so that we have a vice chair.
11	MEMBER WEISMAN: Right. I'm going
12	to have to hone my arts of persuasion.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: So nobody will be
14	answering your e-mails or phone calls.
15	MEMBER CAROE: Julie, you have one
16	other item?
17	MEMBER WEISMAN: Yes. We're not
18	yes, I'm not finished. I'm not finished.
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Oh, sorry.
20	MEMBER WEISMAN: We went a long way
21	to getting commercial availability off this
22	list. However, even with today's, passing of

1	today's recommendation, we will continue now
2	to have to work with the program about what
3	kind of guidance to add for ACAs, in
4	determining commercial availability.
5	Also, that we will need to work on
6	how to amend the evaluation criteria
7	checklists, so that we know that we've gotten
8	the information that we need from petitioners,
9	in order to make an adequate recommendation.
10	Kevin?
11	MEMBER CAROE: Dealing with
12	commercial availability with the ACAs is right
13	now on CAC work plan, but you're welcome to
14	have it.
15	MEMBER WEISMAN: How generous of
16	you, Andrea.
17	MEMBER CAROE: I'm just, you know.
18	I'll share the love.
19	MEMBER WEISMAN: We'll continue to
20	work on the A and B things, and you can have
21	C.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Yes, yes. There's

1	enough on the plate.
2	MEMBER WEISMAN: Right, okay.
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Julie's ambitious.
4	MEMBER WEISMAN: Wait. I'm not
5	done. Review petition substances as needed.
6	That's going to include the avalanche of 606
7	petitions that are going to come in, and then
8	we also have this
9	MEMBER SMILLIE: Isn't that an
10	entire board function? That's not a Handling
11	Committee function.
12	MEMBER WEISMAN: Well, 606 is
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No. It goes to
14	the specific committee.
15	MEMBER WEISMAN: It goes to Handling
16	first.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And then the
18	committees make recommendations to the full
19	board. That's how
20	MEMBER JAMES: Jim's laughing at
21	her.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Jim, you're

1	enjoying this.
2	(Laughter.)
3	MEMBER WEISMAN: And we have some
4	new petitions that we didn't even have to
5	consider, because of the sunset process, such
6	as jelling gum, and I'm sorry I don't have the
7	complete list. But we do have
8	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: We have back
9	petitions that yes.
10	MEMBER WEISMAN: We have petitions
11	that need to be reviewed. And then
12	MS. FRANCES: You will be getting
13	stuff next week.
14	MEMBER WEISMAN: Oh, thank you
15	Valerie.
16	MEMBER CAROE: Thanks. You're not
17	going to even give us a week?
18	MS. FRANCES: I've put it off three,
19	actually.
20	MEMBER WEISMAN: Food contact
21	substances was on the work plan, okay.
22	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: We've got I

1	don't think between now and October. I
2	mean really, I mean it could be back burnered
3	on the work plan, but between now and October
4	are the items that we need to address here
5	now, so that the public knows that we'll be
6	moving forward with those for the October
7	meeting.
8	MEMBER WEISMAN: And respond to Q&As
9	as needed. Is that
10	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Sure.
11	MEMBER WEISMAN: Okay. That's it.
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay.
13	MEMBER KARREMAN: Question for
14	Kevin. You mentioned that the vice chairs of
15	each committee are the liaison for petitions
16	to the Materials Committee.
17	How do you mean? That the vice
18	chair what, shepherds it through the whole
19	process until it gets to the Materials
20	Committee or what?
21	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It's in the policy
22	manual.

1	MEMBER KARREMAN: I should read it.
2	(Laughter.)
3	MEMBER CAROE: That welcome letter
4	that said you were supposed to read that
5	before you showed up.
6	MEMBER KARREMAN: Yep. I got that
7	too.
8	(Simultaneous Discussion.)
9	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Pardon me?
10	PARTICIPANT: Materials Committee
11	work plan?
12	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: The number one
13	item on the Materials Committee is the
14	synthetic/non-synthetic document, and then I
15	need to confer with Nancy, to get her list,
16	and get it in the record.
17	PARTICIPANT: Do we know what
18	(not on mike).
19	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No, we don't.
20	MEMBER CAROE: I've got to go.
21	Sorry, Kevin. I've got to go.
22	MR. NEAL: They're all updated on

1	the website.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: They're on the
3	website, but
4	MR. NEAL: I don't have them off the
5	top of my head.
6	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I don't have them
7	on the top of my head. They're on the website.
8	Gerald?
9	MEMBER DAVIS: Crops Committee work
10	plan. New petitions, lime mud, sulphuric acid
11	in manures, and any other new ones that might
12	come in. I hear there are some.
13	Two older ones, cyprotein isolate
14	and ammonium bicarbonate. I'm assuming we're
15	still hung up with those, waiting for the
16	synthetic/non-synthetic recommendation to be
17	completed, because those too have issues that
18	we felt were unanswerable until we get that
19	one done.
20	Finish the compost heap
21	recommendation, which the two parts left to
22	finish on that is the compost heap itself and

1	dehydrated manures, as part of that, and some
2	vermiculture stuff too.
3	Commercial availability of seed.
4	Look at the August `05 recommendation and
5	possibly improve the recommendation concerning
6	the national database that was suggested in
7	that, as well as comments that came from
8	certifiers about the workload and the
9	ramifications of that, what that would mean
10	for them.
11	Hydroponics is still on the list.
12	Gather information and fact-finding on how and
13	if hydroponics should have or could have
14	standards, organic standards.
15	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And your vice
16	chair? You need to appoint one. Did you
17	appoint one?
18	MEMBER DAVIS: No. I just said we
19	need to pick one.
20	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. I thought
21	he was looking at you. Everyone was looking
22	at you. So okay.

1	(Simultaneous discussion.)
2	MEMBER JAMES: That's how Joe got
3	appointed.
4	MEMBER DAVIS: I looked at Kevin
5	too.
6	(Simultaneous discussion; laughter.)
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay. So that
8	concludes the
9	MEMBER DAVIS: If either one of you
10	are available and interested.
11	MEMBER MOYER: I can do it if you
12	want me to.
13	MEMBER JAMES: Oh, stepping up.
14	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Okay, Jeff.
15	MEMBER DAVIS: Kevin said yes too.
16	Okay. Kevin's deferring to Jeff.
17	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I'll let you guys
18	work it out, just as long as we have one.
19	Okay. Just some quick closing comments,
20	because I know everybody wants to get out of
21	here. We're running late again.
22	So I'd like to certainly thank the

public for all their participation, especially
the few souls that are sticking with us to the
very end. Thank you.

But there was a lot of good input
from the public during this meeting. I'd
certainly like to thank the NOP and staff for
all the hard work that was done in preparation

(Applause.)

for this meeting.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: In recognizing Valerie, this has been a new thing with us to have the executive director.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: It really has been a lot of help on committee calls and getting things together and organized.

I'd like to thank the Livestock Committee, working in conjunction with the NOP and pulling off a very good pasture symposium.

I think we had a lot of good feedback that I've heard from a lot of farmers and people who traveled here to listen to it. So thanks

for everybody's participation in that.

I'd like to thank the board for supporting past board members. I'd like to thank those that are still here as past board members for their help. The current board, thank you so much for getting me through my first experience here as chair.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: And the new members, because I really think the new members came out of the chute just alive and kicking, and it's really good. You've been —the participation has been there.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN O'RELL: No, it's been really good. On the committee participation level, and even at the committee level, there's been a lot of good participation with the new members. So with that --

MEMBER CAROE: Motion to adjourn.

MEMBER SMILLIE: I'd like to thank the philosophy major who kept everybody

1	speaking into the microphones.
2	(Applause.)
3	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: I would accept a
4	motion to adjourn.
5	MEMBER KARREMAN: Second. Wait.
6	Kevin wanted to say something here.
7	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Oh Kevin.
8	MEMBER ENGELBERT: I'd just like to
9	thank all NOSB members, past and present, and
10	the NOP, for making this such a seamless
11	transition for me to come onto the board. I'm
12	very appreciative of all your help.
13	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, and
14	Mark, sorry. You wanted to address us.
15	MR. BRADLEY: Just very briefly, you
16	know. Thank everybody of course for your
17	perseverance through all of this, and the
18	excellent support that we've had from our
19	court reporter and audiovisual person.
20	(Applause.)
21	MR. BRADLEY: I would also like to
22	comment on, again, echoing Kevin's seamless

transition is due in no small part to their 1 2 jumping in with both feet and attacking all these issues. 3 They acted just like senior board 5 members, and we're looking forward to

7

6

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

excellent spirit of cooperation with them, the program, and we'll use -- expect a lot out of our new executive director, Valerie, and she's just doing great. Thank you. Thank you all very much. CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you, Mark.

Just one quick comment before I ask for an adjournment. There's a photographer here that would like to get a picture of the board, whatever's left of us.

So well, he'd like to get what's left, okay. So we promised him -- he's been hanging around to do this, so we're going to go do it. I don't want to hear "camera shy." I will accept a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER SMILLIE: Ι move for adjournment.

1	MEMBER DAVIS: Second.
2	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: All those in
3	favor?
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	CHAIRMAN O'RELL: Thank you.
6	(Whereupon, at 6:31 p.m., the
7	meeting was adjourned.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	